

SINGULAR LAGRANGIAN SYSTEMS ON JET BUNDLES

MANUEL DE LEÓN*

*Instituto de Matemáticas y Física Fundamental, CSIC
C/ Serrano 123. E-28006 Madrid. Spain*JESÚS MARÍN-SOLANO[†]*Departamento de Matemática Económica, Financiera y Actuarial, UB
Av. Diagonal 690. E-08034 Barcelona. Spain*JUAN CARLOS MARRERO[‡]*Departamento de Matemática Fundamental, Fac. Matemáticas, U. La Laguna
La Laguna, Tenerife. Spain*MIGUEL C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA[§], NARCISO ROMÁN-ROY,[¶]*Departamento de Matemática Aplicada IV
Edificio C-3, Campus Norte UPC
C/ Jordi Girona 1. E-08034 Barcelona. Spain*

February 7, 2008

Abstract

The jet bundle description of time-dependent mechanics is revisited. The constraint algorithm for singular Lagrangians is discussed and an exhaustive description of the constraint functions is given. By means of auxiliary connections we give a basis of constraint functions in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian sides. An additional description of constraints is also given considering at the same time compatibility, stability and second order condition problems. Finally, a classification of the constraints in first and second class is obtained using a cosymplectic geometry setting. Using the second class constraints, a Dirac bracket is introduced, extending the well-known construction by Dirac.

Key words: *Jet bundles, Connections, Non-autonomous mechanical systems, Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism, Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints, Poisson and Dirac brackets, Cosymplectic structures.*

AMS s. c. (2000): 37C10, 37J05, 53C05, 53D05, 55R10, 58A20, 70G45, 70H03, 70H05, 70H45.
PACS (1999): 02.40.Vh, 45.20.Jj, 45.90.+t.

*e-mail: MDELEONL@IMAFF.CFMACC.CSIC.ES

†e-mail: JMARIN@ECO.UB.ES

‡e-mail: JCMARRER@ULL.ES

§e-mail: MATMCML@MAT.UPC.ES

¶e-mail: MATNRR@MAT.UPC.ES

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	The general case	5
2.1	Statement of the problem and solution	5
2.2	The constraint algorithm	7
2.3	Stability of vector fields solution. New characterization of constraints	9
3	Lagrangian formalism for mechanical systems	14
3.1	General description of Lagrangian systems	15
3.2	Solving the dynamical Lagrangian equations. Lagrangian constraint algorithm and dynamical Lagrangian constraints	17
4	Hamiltonian formalism for mechanical systems	19
4.1	The momentum dual bundle and the Legendre map. Hyper-regular and almost regular systems	19
4.2	Hamiltonian system associated with an almost regular Lagrangian system	21
4.3	Hamiltonian constraint algorithm and equivalence with the Lagrangian formalism . .	22
4.4	Intrinsic characterization of Hamiltonian constraints	25
4.5	The second order differential equation problem	27
5	Finding Euler-Lagrange vector fields. Dynamical and SODE Lagrangian constraints	28
5.1	SODE condition: SODE first order generation constraints	29
5.2	General expressions of first order generation constraints. $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectability	31
5.3	Stability condition: new generations of constraints	34
5.4	Properties of Euler-Lagrange vector fields	39
6	Dirac brackets and time-dependent constrained Hamiltonian systems	39
6.1	Cosymplectic structures on the restricted momentum dual bundle associated with an almost regular Lagrangian system	40
6.2	First and second class constraints and the solutions of the Hamiltonian dynamics . .	45
6.3	Dirac brackets and evolution of an observable	51

7	Examples	52
7.1	Example 1	52
7.2	Example 2	54
A	Precosymplectic vector spaces	56
B	Poisson and cosymplectic structures and Dirac brackets	59
C	Auxiliary results	62

1 Introduction

For many years the problem of quantizing singular Lagrangians has been the object of much attention. Indeed, if we have a regular Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}:TQ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on the velocity space TQ of a configuration manifold Q , we get a nice Hamiltonian description on the phase space T^*Q : the Lagrangian energy is transported from TQ to T^*Q by the Legendre transformation and, using the canonical symplectic structure on T^*Q we obtain the corresponding Hamilton equations. Next, we can use the standard quantization rules for the canonical Poisson bracket on the cotangent bundle [1].

When the Lagrangian is singular, however, (i.e. the Hessian matrix of $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to the velocities is nonregular) we do not have a nice Hamiltonian description. In fact, not all the momenta are available, so we have some primary constraints defining a submanifold of T^*Q . Moreover, given an initial data and its possible evolution, we have to ensure that it would be again admissible (the tangency condition). Dirac [11] solved the problem by developing a constraint algorithm which gives (in the favourable cases) a final constraint submanifold where a solution of the dynamics exists. In addition, Dirac classified the constraints into two categories: first and second class constraints. The second class constraints were then used to modify the canonical Poisson bracket to obtain a new one (now called the Dirac bracket) which allows us to use the quantization rules. In this approach, an accurate description of the constraint functions plays a crucial role. Dirac's main aim was to apply this procedure to Field theories; indeed, many field theories (for instance, electromagnetism) are singular.

After Dirac, a lot of work was done in order to geometrize his algorithm. The first important step was the work by Gotay *et al* [19], and its application to the Lagrangian formalism [20, 21]. Extension to field theories was always the main aim. Other algorithms were given later, in order to finding consistent solutions of the dynamical equations in the Lagrangian formalism of singular systems (including the second-order problem) [3, 26], and afterwards, new geometric algorithms were developed to be applied both in the Hamiltonian and the Lagrangian formalisms [9, 23, 35, 37, 38, 44].

However, the ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ description of field theories, termed the multisymplectic approach, is the natural extension of time-dependent mechanics. Therefore, if we wish to understand the constraint algorithm for field theories in a covariant formalism, the first step would be to extend the Dirac procedure to time-dependent Lagrangian systems. Some work was provided in [7, 10, 17, 25, 24, 31, 32, 34, 36, 46]. In this paper, we present a complete covariant description for this kind

of system, which generalizes the results of some of the above-mentioned references. Let us explain this formalism:

We consider a configuration fibred manifold $\pi : E \longrightarrow B$, where B is an oriented 1-dimensional manifold ($\mathbb{R}$ or S^1) with volume form η . The Lagrangian density is $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}\eta$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is a function $\mathcal{L} : J^1E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Here J^1E denotes the 1-jet prolongation of E which is called the evolution phase space of the system. If the Lagrangian is regular, then the dynamics is provided by the Euler-Lagrange vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$, which is the Reeb vector field of the cosymplectic structure $(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \eta)$ on J^1E , where $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the Poincaré-Cartan two-form and η is the pull-back to J^1E of the volume form on B :

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0, i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\eta = 1. \quad (1)$$

If $\mathcal{L}$ is not regular, then $(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \eta)$ is no longer cosymplectic so that Eq. (1) has no solution in general (in addition, if such a solution exists it is not necessarily a second order differential equation). Assuming some weak regularity (constancy of the ranks of some distributions), a constraint algorithm can be developed in such a way that, in the better cases, we obtain a sequence of submanifolds which ends in some final constraint submanifold M_f of J^1E . This is done in Section 3.

The constraint functions defining these submanifolds were carefully determined in [10] when E is trivially fibered, say $\pi = pr_1 : E = \mathbb{R} \times Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, in which case $J^1E = \mathbb{R} \times TQ$. Using a convenient decomposition of the Poincaré-Cartan 2-form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ based in the canonical connection in that trivial fibration, the authors have characterized the constraint functions. In this paper, we use a decomposition of $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ based on an arbitrary auxiliary connection in $J^1E \longrightarrow B$. The connection allows us to choose a basis of constraints, and could be understood as a choice of reference.

We also examine the Hamiltonian setting (Section 4), and develop the corresponding constraint algorithm. We give a characterization of the constraints which can be connected to the Lagrangian ones by means of the Legendre transformation $\mathcal{FL}$. This can be done in the case of almost-regular Lagrangians. The characterization obtained here is based again on the choice of a connection in the bundle $\mathcal{P} \longrightarrow B$, where $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{FL}(J^1E)$ is a submanifold (the primary constraint submanifold) of the restricted momentum dual bundle $J^{1*}E$. As in the Lagrangian setting, the connection enables us to choose a basis of constraints. In addition, the Hamiltonian dynamics is obtained and related with the Lagrangian dynamics. We also consider the second order differential equation problem, since the Euler-Lagrange equations are of second order.

Let us say that both algorithms can be considered in abstract as particular cases of a general algorithm developed in Section 2 for the case of a precosymplectic fiber manifold $F \rightarrow B$.

In Section 5 we consider the problem of finding the dynamics, but imposing from the very beginning that this dynamics should simultaneously satisfy the second-order differential equation condition. We characterize the new constraints and relate them to the above approach. The results of this Section are a generalization to the time-dependent case of those given in [9] and [38] for autonomous systems.

In Section 6, we classify the Hamiltonian constraints into first and second class, and define some geometrical projectors which allows us to introduce a Poisson bracket (the Dirac bracket) that has properties similar to the Dirac bracket in the autonomous case: second class constraints become Casimir functions, and the evolution of an observable is given by the bracket with a suitable Hamiltonian function. Note that now we need, in addition, a suitable vector field in order to describe the evolution (the bracket is not enough to do this task).

Finally, we include two examples in Section 7 to illustrate how the procedure for choosing constraints works.

The paper contains also three auxiliary Sections with the purpose of making it selfcontained.

It is very important to point out that, throughout the paper, an auxiliar connection is used for constructing different geometrical structures. In fact, this technique (the use of a connection) was used for the first time in [6], in order to obtain (global) Hamiltonian functions, and afterwards applied both in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms for this and other purposes (see [13, 14, 16, 17, 34, 40, 41]).

We trust that the results contained in the present paper will provide new insights into the problem of characterizing the constraints in classical field theories, and, consequently, in their quantization procedure.

Manifolds are real, paracompact, connected and C^∞ . Maps are C^∞ . Sum over crossed repeated indices is understood.

2 The general case

2.1 Statement of the problem and solution

Let $\kappa: F \rightarrow B$ be a fiber manifold, where $\dim F = 2N + 1$ and the fibers have even dimension $2N$ (B can be $\mathbb{R}$ or S^1). Let $\varpi \in \Omega^1(B)$ be a volume form, and denote $\eta = \kappa^*\varpi$.

Let ∇ be a connection in $\kappa: F \rightarrow B$; that is, ∇ is a κ -semibasic 1-form on F with values in TF such that $\nabla^*\beta = \beta$, for every κ -semibasic form $\beta \in \Omega^1(F)$. As is known, a connection ∇ always exists, and it defines a horizontal subbundle $H(\nabla) \subset TF$, such that $TF = H(\nabla) \oplus V(\kappa)$, where $V(\kappa)$ is the κ -vertical subbundle. If $x \in F$, then $H_x(\nabla) = \text{Im } \nabla_x$. If $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ is the vector field spanning the horizontal subbundle $H(\nabla)$ such that $i(\mathcal{Y})\eta = 1$. Then we can write $\nabla = \eta \otimes \mathcal{Y}$.

For every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$,

$$i(X)\nabla = i(X)(\eta \otimes \mathcal{Y}) = (i(X)\eta)\mathcal{Y} \equiv X^H \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$$

is an *horizontal vector field*; that is, a section of $H(\nabla) \rightarrow F$. X^H is the *horizontal component* of X , and we write $X = X^H + X^V$, where $X^V = X - X^H \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\kappa)}(F)$ (it is a κ -vertical vector field).

Furthermore, if $\alpha \in \Omega^r(F)$, then

$$i(\nabla)\alpha = i(\eta \otimes \mathcal{Y})\alpha = \eta \wedge i(\mathcal{Y})\alpha \equiv \alpha^H.$$

We have that $\alpha = \alpha^H + \alpha^V$, where $\alpha^V = \alpha - \alpha^H$ is a κ -vertical r -form with respect to the connection ∇ , that is, it vanishes under the action of the horizontal vector fields associated with the connection ∇ , and in particular $i(\mathcal{Y})\alpha^V = 0$. Moreover, if $X_1, \dots, X_r \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ are κ -vertical vector fields, then $\alpha^H(X_1, \dots, X_r) = 0$.

The problem we wish to solve can be posed in the following way:

Statement 1 *Given $\kappa: F \rightarrow B$, and η as above, let $\Omega \in \Omega^2(F)$. We wish to find a submanifold $C \hookrightarrow F$ and a section $X: C \rightarrow T_C F$, verifying that $X_x \in T_x C$, for every $x \in C$, and such that the following equations hold:*

$$[i(X)\Omega]_x = 0 \quad , \quad [i(X)\eta]_x = 1 \quad , \quad \text{for every } x \in C . \quad (2)$$

A section $X: C \rightarrow T_C F$ is a “vector field on F with support on C ” (we will denote the set of these vector fields by $\mathfrak{X}(F, C)$).

This is the problem given by (F, Ω, η) . Now we are going to state the above system of equations in an equivalent way.

Theorem 1 *Consider (F, Ω, η) . Let ∇ be a connection in $\kappa: F \rightarrow B$, and consider the induced splitting of Ω . Then, the couple (C, X) (where $C \hookrightarrow F$ is a submanifold, and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F, C)$ is such that $X_x \in T_x C$, for every $x \in C$) is a solution for the problem stated by equations (2) if, and only if, the following system holds:*

$$[i(X)\Omega^V]_x = -[i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega]_x \quad , \quad [i(X)\eta]_x = 1 \quad ; \quad \text{for every } x \in C . \quad (3)$$

(Proof) We have that

$$\Omega = \Omega^H + \Omega^V = \eta \wedge [i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega] + \Omega^V$$

and then, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$,

$$i(X)\Omega = (i(X)\eta)(i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega) - \eta[i(X)i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega] + i(X)\Omega^V . \quad (4)$$

($\implies$) If (C, X) is a solution of equations (2), from (4) we have that

$$0 = [i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega]_x - \eta_x[i(X)i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega]_x + [i(X)\Omega^V]_x \quad , \quad \text{for every } x \in C$$

but $[i(X)i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega]_x = 0$, because $[i(X)\Omega]_x = 0$, and the equations (3) hold.

($\impliedby$) If (C, X) is a solution of equations (3) then, from (4) we have that

$$[i(X)\Omega]_x = -\eta_x[i(X)i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega]_x = \eta_x[i(X)i(X)\Omega^V]_x = 0 \quad , \quad \text{for every } x \in C .$$

■

From the equivalence of equations (2) (which are independent of the choice of the connection ∇) and (3), we have:

Corollary 1 *The couple (C, X) , solution of equations (3), is independent of the connection ∇ .*

The case we will focus on is:

Assumption 1 $\Omega \in \Omega^2(F)$ and $\eta \in \Omega^1(F)$ are closed forms, (and $\nabla = \eta \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ is a fixed connection in the fiber manifold $\kappa: F \rightarrow B$).

Then, we will denote

$$\gamma \equiv i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega \quad , \quad \omega \equiv \Omega^V = \Omega - \eta \wedge \gamma .$$

(Notice that $i(\mathcal{Y})\gamma = 0$, and $i(\mathcal{Y})\omega = 0$). Finally, with this notation, equations (3) become

$$[i(X)\omega]_x = -\gamma_x \quad , \quad [i(X)\eta]_x = 1 \quad ; \quad \text{for every } x \in C . \quad (5)$$

Now, introducing the map (see Appendix A)

$$\begin{aligned} \flat_{(\eta, \omega)} &: \mathbf{T}F \rightarrow \mathbf{T}^*F \\ (x, v) &\mapsto i(v)\omega_x + (i(v)\eta_x)\eta_x \end{aligned}$$

we can state the following fundamental result:

Theorem 2 *The necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a submanifold $C \hookrightarrow F$ and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F, C)$, with $X_x \in \mathbf{T}_x C$, for every $x \in C$, such that the equations (2) (or equivalently equations (5)) hold, is that*

$$\eta_x - \gamma_x \in \flat_{(\eta_x, \omega_x)}(\mathbf{T}_x C) \quad ; \quad \text{for every } x \in C \quad (6)$$

or, what is equivalent

$$\langle \eta_x - \gamma_x, \mathbf{T}_x^\perp C \rangle = 0 \quad ; \quad \text{for every } x \in C$$

where $\flat_{(\eta_x, \omega_x)} = \flat_{(\eta, \omega)|\mathbf{T}_x F}$ and $\mathbf{T}_x^\perp C \equiv (\mathbf{T}_x C)^\perp := [\flat_{(\eta_x, \omega_x)}(\mathbf{T}_x C)]^0$.

(Proof) ($\implies$) It is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and the definition of $\flat_{(\eta_x, \omega_x)}$.

($\impliedby$) Suppose that a submanifold $C \hookrightarrow F$ and a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F, C)$ tangent to C exist, such that (6) holds. This means that, for every $x \in C$,

$$\eta_x - \gamma_x = \flat_{(\eta_x, \omega_x)}(X_x) = [i(X)\omega]_x + [i(X)\eta]_x \eta_x. \quad (7)$$

Contracting both members with $\mathcal{Y}$ we obtain

$$[i(\mathcal{Y})\eta]_x - [i(\mathcal{Y})\gamma]_x = [i(\mathcal{Y})i(X)\omega]_x + [i(\mathcal{Y})\eta i(X)\eta]_x$$

and, as $i(\mathcal{Y})\eta = 1$, $i(\mathcal{Y})\gamma = 0$, and $i(\mathcal{Y})\omega = 0$, we conclude that $[i(X)\eta]_x = 1$. Therefore, from (7) we have that $[i(X)\omega]_x = -\gamma_x$, and the result follows from Theorem 1. $\blacksquare$

Remark 1 Every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F, C)$ can be extended to define a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$. Therefore, although we are really interested in finding vector fields on F at support on C , from now on we will suppose that the vector fields are defined everywhere in F .

2.2 The constraint algorithm

Now we will apply the last result in order to solve the problem stated above; that is, to find a submanifold $C \hookrightarrow F$, transverse to the projection $\kappa: F \rightarrow B$, and a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$, such that

1. $[i(X)\Omega]_x = 0$, and $[i(X)\eta]_x = 1$, for every $x \in C$.
2. $X|_C$ is tangent to C .

The procedure is algorithmic, and produces a sequence of subsets $\{C_i\}$ of F . Then, we will assume that:

Assumption 2 *Every subset C_i of this sequence is a regular submanifold of F , and its natural injection is an embedding.*

Thus, we consider the submanifold $C_1 \hookrightarrow F$ where a solution exists; that is,

$$C_1 = \{x \in F \mid \exists X \in T_x F : i(X_x)\Omega_x = 0, i(X_x)\eta_x = 1\}.$$

Then there is a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ such that $[i(X)\Omega]|_{C_1} = 0$, $[i(X)\eta]|_{C_1} = 1$. But in general X is not tangent to C_1 . We can consider therefore the submanifold

$$C_2 = \{x \in C_1 \mid \exists X \in T_x C_1 : i(X_x)\Omega_x = 0, i(X_x)\eta_x = 1\}.$$

Then there will be a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ tangent to C_1 such that $[i(X)\Omega]|_{C_2} = 0$, $[i(X)\eta]|_{C_2} = 1$. Again, X may not be tangent to C_2 . Following this process, we obtain a sequence of constrained submanifolds

$$\dots \xrightarrow{j_{i+1}^i} C_i \xrightarrow{j_i^{i-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{j_2^1} C_1 \xrightarrow{j_1} C_0 \equiv F. \quad (8)$$

For every $i \geq 1$, C_i is called the *ith constraint submanifold*.

This procedure will be called the *constraint algorithm*, and we have three possibilities:

- There exists an integer $k > 0$ such that $C_k = \emptyset$. This means that the equations are not consistent; that is, they have no solution.
- There exists an integer $k > 0$ such that $C_k \neq \emptyset$, but $\dim C_k = 0$. In this case, there is no dynamics. C_k consists of isolated points, and the solution of the equations is $X = 0$.
- There exists an integer $k > 0$ such that $C_{k+1} = C_k \equiv C_f$, and $\dim C_f > 0$. In such a case, there exists a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$, tangent to C_f , such that

$$[i(X)\Omega]|_{C_f} = 0, [i(X)\eta]|_{C_f} = 1$$

In this case, the manifold C_f is called the *final constraint submanifold*. This is the situation which is of concern to us.

Next we wish to give an intrinsic characterization of the constraints which define the constraint submanifolds C_i . In order to do this, following the same pattern as in Theorem 2, we conclude that:

Proposition 1 *Every submanifold C_i ($i \geq 1$) in the sequence (8) can be defined as*

$$C_i = \{x \in C_{i-1} \mid \langle \eta_x - \gamma_x, T_x^\perp C_{i-1} \rangle = 0\}.$$

Therefore, if the distribution $T^\perp C_{i-1}$ has constant rank, and $\{Z_1^{(i-1)}, \dots, Z_r^{(i-1)}\}$ is a set of vector fields spanning locally this distribution, then C_i , as a submanifold of C_{i-1} , is defined locally as the zero set of the functions $\chi_j^{(i)} \in C^\infty(F)$ given by

$$\chi_j^{(i)} = i(Z_j^{(i-1)})(\eta - \gamma) \quad , \quad (j = 1, \dots, r).$$

These functions are called *ith-generation constraints*.

2.3 Stability of vector fields solution. New characterization of constraints

The solutions of the equations (2) are now analyzed. Thus, consider the problem posed in Statement 1. Once we have found the submanifold C_1 where a solution exists, we impose the tangency condition for the vector field solutions. This enables us to obtain a new characterization of the constraints defining the submanifolds of the sequence (8). To do this we need the following additional hypothesis (and the results stated in Appendices A and C):

Assumption 3 *The distributions $T^\perp C_0 = T^\perp F = \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, and $T^\perp_{C_1} C_0 \cap TC_1$ have constant rank.*

From the first part of Lemma 13 we deduce that these conditions are independent of the connection ∇ .

If $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ verifies that

$$[i(X)\omega]|_{C_1} = -\gamma|_{C_1} \quad , \quad [i(X)\eta]|_{C_1} = 1 \quad (9)$$

then, from now on, we can assume that $i(X)\eta = 1$ everywhere in F . In fact, since if $i(X)\eta \neq 1$, we take $X' = X + [1 - i(X)\eta]\mathcal{Y}$, and it is clear that $X'|_{C_1} = X|_{C_1}$, and $i(X')\eta = i(X)\eta + 1 - i(X)\eta = 1$. Therefore:

Proposition 2 *Let X be a vector field on F such that equations (9) hold, and verifying the above condition.*

1. *If $Z, Y \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, such that Z is tangent to C_1 , then*

$$i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\omega|_{C_1} - \eta[i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\eta]|_{C_1} = d[i(Z)\gamma]|_{C_1}$$

and, as a consequence,

$$\{[X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y} + Y\}_x \in T_x^\perp C_1 \quad , \quad \text{for every } x \in C_1 \quad .$$

2. *If $Z' \in \mathfrak{X}(C_0)$ such that $Z'|_x \in T_x^\perp C_1$, for every $x \in C_1$, then there exist locally $Z, Y \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, such that Z is tangent to C_1 , and $Z'|_{C_1} = \{[X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y} + Y\}|_{C_1}$.*

(Proof)

1. It is clear that $Y_x \in T_x^\perp C_1$, since $Y \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, hence $\flat_{(\eta_x, \omega_x)}(X_1)(Y_x) = 0$, for $X_1 \in T_{x_1} C_1$.

For $[X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\eta &= L(X)i(Z)\eta - i(Z)L(X)\eta - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]i(\mathcal{Y})\eta \\ &= -L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and

$$i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\omega = i([X, Z])\omega - [L(\mathcal{Y})i(Z)\gamma]i(\mathcal{Y})\omega = i([X, Z])\omega \quad . \quad (11)$$

However, from the second equality, for every $X' \in \mathfrak{X}(C_0)$, and bearing in mind that $Z \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$ and that $\omega = \Omega - \eta \wedge \gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
i(X') i([X, Z])\omega &= i(X') [L(X) i(Z) - i(Z) L(X)]\omega = i(X') [-i(Z) i(X) d\omega - i(Z) d i(X)\omega] \\
&= i(X') [-i(Z) i(X) d\Omega - i(Z) i(X) (\eta \wedge d\gamma) - i(Z) d i(X)\omega] \\
&= -i(X') i(Z) \{ [i(X)\eta] d\gamma - \eta \wedge i(X) d\gamma + d i(X)\omega \} \\
&= -[i(X)\eta] i(X') i(Z) d\gamma - [i(X')\eta] [i(Z) i(X) d\gamma] - i(X') i(Z) d i(X)\omega \\
&= -[i(X)\eta] i(X') i(Z) d\gamma - [i(X')\eta] [i(Z) i(X) d\gamma] - \\
&\quad i(X') L(Z) i(X)\omega + i(X') d i(Z) i(X)\omega \\
&= -[i(X)\eta] i(X') i(Z) d\gamma - [i(X')\eta] [i(Z) i(X) d\gamma] - \\
&\quad L(Z) i(X') i(X)\omega + i([Z, X']) i(X)\omega .
\end{aligned}$$

On C_1 , using (9), and taking into account that $-L(Z)[i(X') i(X)\omega]|_{C_1} = [L(Z) i(X')\gamma]|_{C_1}$ (since Z is tangent to C_1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
i(X') i([X, Z])\omega|_{C_1} &= -i(X') i(Z) d\gamma|_{C_1} - [i(X')\eta] [i(Z) i(X) d\gamma]|_{C_1} - \\
&\quad L(Z) i(X') i(X)\omega|_{C_1} + i([Z, X']) i(X)\omega|_{C_1} \\
&= -i(X') L(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} + i(X') d i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} - [i(X')\eta] [i(Z) i(X) d\gamma]|_{C_1} + \\
&\quad L(Z) i(X')\gamma|_{C_1} - i([Z, X'])\gamma|_{C_1} \\
&= i([Z, X'])\gamma|_{C_1} + L(X') i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} - \\
&\quad [i(X')\eta] [i(Z) i(X) d\gamma]|_{C_1} - i([Z, X'])\gamma|_{C_1} \\
&= L(X') i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} - [i(X')\eta] [i(Z) i(X) d\gamma]|_{C_1} .
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Furthermore, using that $\gamma = i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega$ and that Ω is closed,

$$\begin{aligned}
i(Z) i(X) d\gamma|_{C_1} &= i(Z) i(X) L(\mathcal{Y})\Omega|_{C_1} \\
&= L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z) i(X)\Omega|_{C_1} + i([\mathcal{Y}, X]) i(Z)\Omega|_{C_1} - i([\mathcal{Y}, Z]) i(X)\Omega|_{C_1} \\
&= L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

since $i(X)\Omega|_{C_1} = 0$ (because X is a solution), $i(Z)\Omega|_{C_1} = 0$ (by Lemma 18, Appendix C), and $i(Z) i(X)\Omega = i(Z) i(X)\omega + i(Z)\gamma = i(Z)\gamma$. Therefore, from (11), (12) and (13),

$$i(X') \{ i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\omega \}|_{C_1} = \{ L(X') i(Z)\gamma - [i(X')\eta] L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma \}|_{C_1} .$$

Moreover, from (10),

$$i(X') \{ \eta [i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\eta] \}|_{C_1} = -[i(X')\eta] L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} .$$

Hence we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
i(X') [i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\omega - \eta [i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\eta]]|_{C_1} &= \\
&= [L(X') i(Z)\gamma]|_{C_1} = [i(X') d i(Z)\gamma]|_{C_1} ,
\end{aligned}$$

for every $X' \in \mathfrak{X}(C_0)$, so

$$i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\omega|_{C_1} - \eta [i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\eta]|_{C_1} = d[i(Z)\gamma]|_{C_1} .$$

Finally, notice that $T_x^\perp C_1 = \{v_x \in T_x C_0 \mid \langle b_{(\eta_x, \omega_x)}(u_x), v_x \rangle = 0, \forall u_x \in T_x C_1\}$. That is, $\langle i(v_x)\omega_x - [i(v_x)\eta_x]\eta_x, u_x \rangle = 0$, for every $u_x \in T_x C_1$. Taking $v_x = \{[X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y} + Y\}_x$, we obtain that $\langle i(v_x)\omega_x - [i(v_x)\eta_x]\eta_x, u_x \rangle = [L(W) i(Z)\gamma]|_x = 0$, if U is a vector field tangent to C_1 such that $U(x) = u_x$ (notice that $i(Z)(\eta - \gamma) = -i(Z)\gamma$ is a constraint function defining C_1 in C_0). Therefore, $v_x \in T_x^\perp C_1$.

2. Consider a local basis $\{Z_1^{(0)}, \dots, Z_{r_1}^{(0)}\}$ of the distribution $\ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, in an open set $U \subset F$. Then the 1-forms $d i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1}$, $i = 1, \dots, r_1$ generate the annihilator of $T_{U \cap C_1} C_1$. Therefore

$$\{i(Z')\omega - [i(Z')\eta]\eta\}|_{C_1} = \tilde{f}^i [d i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma]|_{C_1}$$

where $\tilde{f}^i \in C^\infty(U \cap C_1)$ are arbitrary functions, which can be extended to functions $f^i \in C^\infty(U)$. Thus, we consider $Z = f^i Z_i^{(0)}$, then $i(Z)\gamma = f^i i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma$, and

$$[d i(Z)\gamma]|_{C_1} = f^i|_{C_1} [d i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma]|_{C_1} + (df^i)|_{C_1} i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} = f^i|_{C_1} [d i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma]|_{C_1}.$$

Hence, comparing these last equations, we conclude that

$$\{i(Z')\omega - [i(Z')\eta]\eta\}|_{C_1} = [d i(Z)\gamma]|_{C_1} \quad (14)$$

and in this way, for every $Z_i^{(0)}$,

$$0 = \{i(Z_i^{(0)})(i(Z')\omega - [i(Z')\eta]\eta)\}|_{C_1} = L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1}. \quad (15)$$

Now,

$$i(Z) L(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} = \{i(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})d\gamma + i(Z)d i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma\}|_{C_1} = \{i(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})d\gamma + L(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma\}|_{C_1}.$$

Also,

$$i([Z_i^{(0)}, Z])\gamma|_{C_1} = \{L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z)\gamma - i(Z) L(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma\}|_{C_1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} i(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})d\gamma|_{C_1} &= \{i(Z) L(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma - L(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma\}|_{C_1} = \\ &= \{L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z)\gamma - L(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma - i([Z_i^{(0)}, Z])\gamma\}|_{C_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the first item of Lemma 19 (Appendix C), we have

$$0 = i(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})d\gamma|_{C_1} = L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} - L(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} - i([Z_i^{(0)}, Z])\gamma|_{C_1}.$$

Hence, $L(Z) i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} = L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} - i([Z_i^{(0)}, Z])\gamma|_{C_1}$. But $L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} = 0$ (see (15)) and, using the second item of the Lemma 19 and the characterization of C_1 , $i([Z_i^{(0)}, Z])\gamma|_{C_1} = 0$. Therefore, Z is tangent to C_1 . Finally, from (1), (14) and the first part of this Proposition, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{i(Z' - [X, Z] + [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\omega - [i(Z' - [X, Z] + [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\eta]\eta\}|_{C_1} = \\ &= \{i(Z')\omega - [i(Z')\eta]\eta\}|_{C_1} - \{i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\omega - [i([X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y})\eta]\eta\}|_{C_1} = \\ &= d i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} - d i(Z)\gamma|_{C_1} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and this means that

$$Z' - [X, Z] + [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y} \in T_x^\perp C_0 = \ker \omega_x \cap \ker \eta_x, \quad \forall x \in C_1,$$

i.e., $Z'|_{C_1} = \{[X, Z] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z)\gamma]\mathcal{Y} + Y\}|_{C_1}$, with $Y \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$. ■

Using this Proposition we can construct a local system of generators for $T^\perp C_1$. In fact:

Corollary 2

Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ be such that equations (9) hold, r_0 the rank of the distribution $T_{C_1}^\perp C_0 \cap TC_1$, and $\{Z_1^{(0)}, \dots, Z_{r_0}^{(0)}, Z_{r_0+1}^{(0)}, \dots, Z_{r_1}^{(0)}\}$ a local basis for $\ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$ (in a neighbourhood of a point $x \in C_1$), where $\{Z_i^{(0)}\}_{i=1, \dots, r_0}$ are tangent to C_1 . Then $T^\perp C_1$ is locally generated by the vector fields

$$\{Z_1^{(0)}, \dots, Z_{r_0}^{(0)}, Z_{r_0+1}^{(0)}, \dots, Z_{r_1}^{(0)}, [X, Z_i^{(0)}] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_i^{(0)}) \gamma] \mathcal{Y}\}_{i=1, \dots, r_0}.$$

Remark 2 From now on, we will denote by $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(C_i)$ the set of vector fields of $\mathfrak{X}(F, C_i)$ which span locally the distribution $T^\perp C_i$. This set can be characterized as

$$\mathfrak{X}^\perp(C_i) = \{Z \in \mathfrak{X}(F) \mid j_i^*[i(Z)\omega - (i(Z)\eta)\eta] = 0\}$$

where $j_i: C_i \hookrightarrow F$ denotes the corresponding embedding.

Since $C_2 = \{x \in C_1 \mid \langle \eta_x - \gamma_x, T_x^\perp C_1 \rangle = 0\}$ and $i(Z_j^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma)|_{C_1} = 0$, if we introduce the functions

$$\chi_i^{(2)} := i([X, Z_i^{(0)}] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_i^{(0)}) \gamma] \mathcal{Y})(\eta - \gamma)$$

we conclude that a basis of constraints for C_2 is made by those functions which do not vanish on C_1 . Bearing in mind that $i([X, Z_k^{(0)}])\eta|_{C_1} = 0$, $i(\mathcal{Y})\gamma|_{C_1} = 0$ and $i(\mathcal{Y})\eta = 1$, they can be characterized as

$$\chi_i^{(2)} = -i([X, Z_i^{(0)}])\gamma - (\mathcal{Y}[i(Z_i^{(0)})\gamma]) . \quad (16)$$

Next we will analyze the solutions of the dynamical equations. First we describe the set of solutions on C_1 .

Proposition 3 *The general solution of the equations (2) on the submanifold $C_1 \hookrightarrow F$ where they are compatible is $X^{(0)} + Y^{(0)}$, where $X^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ is a particular solution and $Y^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}(F)$ is an arbitrary element of $\ker \Omega \cap \ker \eta$.*

(Proof) It is a consequence of the linearity of $i(X)\Omega$ and $i(X)\eta$ on the vector field X . ■

Taking into account the above results, we can write these solutions in the form

$$X = X^{(0)} + Y^{(0)} = X^{(0)} + f^i Z_i^{(0)} + f^k Z_k^{(0)} \quad (i = 1, \dots, r_0 ; k = r_0 + 1, \dots, r_1) .$$

Now we must identify the points of C_1 where there are solutions tangent to C_1 . Consider the set of independent constraints $\{\chi_i^{(1)}\}$ defining locally C_1 as a closed submanifold of $C_0 = F$, which by Proposition 1 are described in the following way

$$\{i(Z_i^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma)\}_{i=1, \dots, r_0} \quad , \quad \{i(Z_k^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma)\}_{k=r_0+1, \dots, r_1} .$$

Then the tangency condition imposes that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= L(X^{(0)} + f^i Z_i^{(0)} + f^k Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma)|_{C_1} \\ &= -L(X^{(0)}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} - f^i L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} - f^k L(Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= L(X^{(0)} + f^i Z_i^{(0)} + f^k Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_{k'}^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma)|_{C_1} \\ &= -L(X^{(0)}) i(Z_{k'}^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} - f^i L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z_{k'}^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} - f^k L(Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_{k'}^{(0)})\gamma|_{C_1} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we have taken into account that, as a consequence of Lemma 17, $L(Z^{(0)})\eta|_{C_1} = 0$, for every $Z^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(C_0)$. We will need the following result:

Lemma 1 *The matrix $(A_{kk'}) \equiv \left(L(Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_{k'}^{(0)}) \gamma \right)$ ($k, k' = r_0 + 1, \dots, r_1$) is regular, for every $x \in C_1$ (in the corresponding neighbourhood).*

(Proof) Let us suppose that the rows of this matrix are dependent for a point $x \in C_1$. Then,

$$\mu^k Z_k^{(0)}(x_1) (i(Z_{k'}^{(0)}) \gamma) = 0 \quad , \quad \text{for all } k', \text{ with } \mu^k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then, by Lemma 19, if $Z_i^{(0)}$, $i = 1, \dots, r_0$, are tangent to C_1 , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} L(Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_i^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} &= i([Z_k^{(0)}, Z_i^{(0)}]) \gamma|_{C_1} + i(Z_i^{(0)}) L(Z_k^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} \\ &= i(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z_k^{(0)}) d\gamma|_{C_1} + i(Z_i^{(0)}) d(i(Z_k^{(0)}) \gamma)|_{C_1} = L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z_k^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and hence

$$\mu^k Z_k^{(0)}(x) (i(Z_i^{(0)}) (\gamma)) = 0, \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, r_1.$$

Therefore $\mu^k (Z_k^{(0)})_x \in T_x C_1$ and hence $\mu^k (Z_k^{(0)})_x \in T_x^\perp C_0 \cap T_x C_1$, for every $x \in C_1$, but as $\{(Z_1^{(0)})_x, \dots, (Z_{r_0}^{(0)})_x\}$ is a basis of $T_x^\perp C_0 \cap T_x C_1$, we must conclude that $\mu^k = 0$, for every $k = r_0 + 1, \dots, r_1$. ■

Since $L(Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_i^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} = L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z_k^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} = 0$, system (18) becomes

$$0 = L(X^{(0)}) i(Z_{k'}^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} + f^k L(Z_k^{(0)}) i(Z_{k'}^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1}$$

which is a linear system on the coefficients f^k . As a consequence of the last Lemma, this system has a unique solution that gives us the coefficients $f^k|_{C_1}$. Then the general solution on C_1 can be written as

$$X = X^{(0)} + f^k Z_k^{(0)} + f^i Z_i^{(0)} \equiv X^{(1)} + Y^{(1)} \quad (i = 1, \dots, r_0 ; k = r_0 + 1, \dots, r_1)$$

where $X^{(1)} \equiv X^{(0)} + f^k Z_k^{(0)}$ and $Y^{(1)}$ denote the determined and the undetermined parts of the solution, respectively.

Furthermore, since

$$\begin{aligned} L(Z_i^{(0)}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} &= i([Z_i^{(0)}, Z_{i'}^{(0)}]) \gamma|_{C_1} + i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) L(Z_i^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} \\ &= -i(\mathcal{Y}) i([Z_i^{(0)}, Z_{i'}^{(0)}]) \Omega|_{C_1} + i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) i(Z_i^{(0)}) d\gamma|_{C_1} - i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) d[i(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_i^{(0)}) \Omega]|_{C_1} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

(where we have used that $\gamma = i(\mathcal{Y}) \Omega$ and Lemmas 18 and 19), system (17) reduces to

$$0 = L(X^{(0)}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1}$$

and, if these equalities do not hold, they give the constraint which defines locally the submanifold C_2 as a submanifold of C_1 . In fact, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} L(X^{(0)}) [i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma]|_{C_1} &= i(X^{(0)}) d[i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma]|_{C_1} \\ &= i(X^{(0)}) \{i([X, Z_{i'}^{(0)}] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma] \mathcal{Y}) \omega \\ &\quad - \eta[i([X, Z_{i'}^{(0)}] - [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma] \mathcal{Y}) \eta]\}|_{C_1} \\ &= i(X^{(0)}) i([X, Z_{i'}^{(0)}]) \omega + [L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma] i(X^{(0)}) \eta|_{C_1} \\ &= -i([X, Z_{i'}^{(0)}]) i(X^{(0)}) \omega|_{C_1} + L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} \\ &= i([X, Z_{i'}^{(0)}]) \gamma|_{C_1} + L(\mathcal{Y}) i(Z_{i'}^{(0)}) \gamma|_{C_1} \end{aligned}$$

where we employ the first item of Proposition 2 and $i(X^{(0)})\eta|_C = 1$, $i(X)\eta = 1$ (since X is a particular solution). Observe that this result is just the characterization of the 2nd-generation constraints given in (16).

This study has been done for the submanifold C_1 , but it can be extended to every level of the constraint algorithm. As in the case of the submanifold C_1 , we will assume that for every submanifold C_i ($i \geq 0$) of the sequence (8), the distributions $T^\perp C_i$ and $T^\perp_{C_{i+1}} C_i \cap TC_{i+1}$ have constant rank (note that from the second part of Lemma 13, we deduce that the first of these conditions is independent of the connection ∇). Under the above conditions, we have

Theorem 3 *Consider the sequence $\{C_i\}$ of submanifolds (8). For every $i \geq 1$, let $r_{(i-1)}, r_i$ be the ranks of the distributions $T^\perp C_{i-1}$ and $T^\perp_{C_i} C_{i-1} \cap TC_i$ respectively, and consider a local basis for $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(C_{i-1})$ (in a neighbourhood of a point $x \in C_i$)*

$$\{Z_1^{(i-1)}, \dots, Z_{r_{(i-1)}}^{(i-1)}, Z_{r_{(i-1)}+1}^{(i-1)}, \dots, Z_{r_i}^{(i-1)}\}$$

where $\{Z_j^{(i-1)}\}_{j=1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}}$ are tangent to C_i . Finally, let $X = X^{(i-1)} + Y^{(i-1)}$ be the general solution on the submanifold C_i , where $X^{(i-1)}$ and $Y^{(i-1)}$ denote the determined and the undetermined parts of the solutions, respectively.

1. Every submanifold C_{i+1} in this sequence can be defined (in C_i) as the zero set of the so-called $(i+1)$ th-generation constraints, $\{\chi^{(i+1)}\} \subset C^\infty(F)$, which are characterized in the following equivalent ways:

(a) For every $Z^{(i)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(C_i)$,

$$\chi^{(i+1)} = i(Z^{(i)})(\eta - \gamma) .$$

(b) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}\}$,

$$\chi^{(i+1)} = L(X^{(i-1)})[i(Z_j^{(i-1)})(\eta - \gamma)] .$$

(c) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}\}$,

$$\chi^{(i+1)} = i([X^{(i-1)}, Z_j^{(i-1)}])\gamma + L(\mathcal{Y})[i(Z_j^{(i-1)})\gamma] .$$

2. For every $k \in \{r_{(i-1)} + 1, \dots, r_i\}$ the stability condition

$$0 = L(X^{(i-1)} + Y^{(i-1)})[i(Z_k^{(i-1)})(\eta - \gamma)]|_{C_i}$$

determines (partially or totally) $Y^{(i-1)}$ (on C_i).

3 Lagrangian formalism for mechanical systems

In this section we wish to apply the above results in order to study the evolution equations of non-autonomous singular Lagrangian systems. By using the constraint algorithm we will obtain a final constraint submanifold defined by the so-called dynamical Lagrangian constraints. However, this problem shows special features since, in addition to solving the dynamical equations, we must find solutions satisfying the so-called *Second-order condition*. This condition will be studied in Sections 4.5 and 5.

3.1 General description of Lagrangian systems

(For more details on the jet bundle description of non-autonomous Lagrangian systems see, for instance, [12], [13], [14], [17], [18], [32] and [42]).

Let $\pi: E \rightarrow B$ be the *configuration fibered manifold* of a non-autonomous mechanical system, with volume form $\varpi \in \Omega^1(B)$, and E is an $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold. $\pi^1: J^1E \rightarrow E$ is the jet bundle of local sections of π , which is called the *evolution phase space* of the system. The map $\bar{\pi}^1 = \pi \circ \pi^1: J^1E \rightarrow B$ defines another structure of differentiable fibered manifold. Finally, (t, q^ρ, v^ρ) (with $\rho = 1, \dots, n$) will denote natural local systems of coordinates in J^1E adapted to the projection $\pi: E \rightarrow B$, and such that the form $\eta := \bar{\pi}^{1*}\varpi$ can be locally written as $\eta = dt$.

Note that J^1E is an embedded submanifold of the tangent bundle TE of E . In fact, the map $\iota: J^1E \rightarrow TE$ defined by

$$\iota(j_{t_0}^1 \phi) = \phi_{*t_0}(V_\varpi(t_0))$$

for $t_0 \in B$ and ϕ a local section of $\pi: E \rightarrow B$, is an embedding. Here, V_ϖ denotes the vector field on B characterized by the condition $\varpi(V_\varpi) = 1$. If we consider fibered coordinates (z, q^ρ, v^ρ) on J^1E and $(t, q^\rho, \dot{t}, v^\rho)$ on TE then the local expression of ι is

$$\iota(t, q^\rho, v^\rho) = (t, q^\rho, 1, v^\rho).$$

The dynamical information is given by introducing a *Lagrangian density* which is a $\bar{\pi}^1$ -semibasic 1-form on J^1E . Then there is a function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(J^1E)$ such that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}\eta$, which is called the *Lagrangian function* associated with $\mathcal{L}$ and η . The *Poincaré-Cartan 1 and 2-forms* associated with the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ are defined using the *vertical endomorphism* $\mathcal{V}$ of the bundle J^1E :

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} := i(\mathcal{V})\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L} \in \Omega^1(J^1E) \quad ; \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} := -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(J^1E).$$

Then a *Lagrangian system* is a couple $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$.

In a natural chart in J^1E we have that

$$\mathcal{V} = (dq^\rho - v^\rho dt) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\rho} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho} dq^\rho - \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho} v^\rho - \mathcal{L} \right) dt, \\ \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= -\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho \partial v^\nu} dv^\rho \wedge dv^\nu - \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^\rho \partial v^\nu} dq^\rho \wedge dq^\nu + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho \partial v^\nu} v^\nu dv^\rho \wedge dt + \\ &\quad \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^\rho \partial v^\nu} v^\nu - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^\rho} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial t \partial v^\rho} \right) dq^\rho \wedge dt. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Notice also that

$$\eta \wedge \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}^n = (-1)^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}} n! \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho \partial v^\nu} \right)_{\rho, \nu=1, \dots, n} dt \wedge dq^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dq^n \wedge dv^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dv^n.$$

As usual, we say that a Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L}$ (and hence the corresponding Lagrangian system) is *regular* if its associated form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ has maximal rank, or what is equivalent, the couple $(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \eta)$ is a *cosymplectic structure*. This is also equivalent to demanding that $\det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho \partial v^\nu} \right)$ is different from zero at every point. There exists a more general notion of regularity in the recent geometrical approach based on Lepagean forms [28, 29, 30] (see also [27]). For Lagrangian systems of order 1, both definitions coincide.

A variational problem can be posed from the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$, which is called the *Hamilton principle* of the Lagrangian formalism: the dynamical trajectories are canonical liftings of the sections of π which are critical for the functional $\mathbf{L}: \Gamma_c(B, E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\mathbf{L}(\phi) := \int_B (j^1\phi)^*\mathcal{L}$, for every $\phi \in \Gamma_c(B, E)$ ($\Gamma_c(B, E)$ denotes the set of compact supported sections of π , and $j^1\phi$ is the canonical lifting of ϕ to J^1E). Therefore, it can be proved that the critical sections of the Hamilton variational principle are the integral curves of an *holonomic* vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$, (also called a *Second Order Differential Equation* or SODE), satisfying that:

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0 \quad , \quad i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\eta \neq 0$$

The second equation means that the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is $\bar{\pi}^1$ -transverse. It is usual to write this condition in the form

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\eta = 1$$

and, locally, this is equivalent to fixing the parametrization of the integral curves, taking as parameter the coordinate t . From now on we will follow this convention.

Remark 3 Let $\phi \in \Gamma_c(M, E)$ be a section such that $j^1\phi$ is an integral curve of a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ which is a solution to the above equations. Then ϕ verifies the *Euler-Lagrange equations*:

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^\rho} \right|_{j^1\phi} - \frac{d}{dt} \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho} \right|_{j^1\phi} = 0 \quad , \quad (\text{for } \rho = 1, \dots, n)$$

and conversely.

We can characterize SODE vector fields in J^1E in a more suitable way, by using the vertical endomorphism. In fact, as $\mathcal{V} \in \Omega^1(J^1E) \otimes \Gamma(J^1E, V(\pi^1)) \otimes \Gamma(J^1E, \bar{\pi}^{1*}TB)$, we can contract the last factor with elements of $\Gamma(J^1E, \bar{\pi}^{1*}\Lambda^1T^*B)$, thus obtaining an element of $\Omega^1(J^1E) \otimes \Gamma(J^1E, V(\pi^1))$, in a natural way. Therefore, we define the *canonical endomorphism* $\mathcal{J} \in \Omega^1(J^1E) \otimes \Gamma(J^1E, V(\pi^1))$ by making

$$\mathcal{J} = i(\mathcal{V})\eta$$

whose local expression in a natural chart of J^1E is

$$\mathcal{J} = i(\mathcal{V})\eta = (dq^\rho - v^\rho dt) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\rho} .$$

Now, it can be proved that a vector field $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is a SODE if, and only if, the following conditions hold

$$\mathcal{J}(D) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad i(D)\eta = 1 .$$

So, in Lagrangian mechanics, we search for vector fields $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ such that:

1. They are solutions of the so-called *dynamical Lagrangian equations* (1)

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0 \quad , \quad i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\eta = 1 .$$

2. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ are holonomic (SODE); that is, $\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$.

As is well known, if $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a regular Lagrangian system, then there exists a unique Euler-Lagrange vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ for this system (in fact, $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the *Reeb's vector field* of the cosymplectic structure $(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \eta)$). This result does not hold for non-regular Lagrangian systems, and

if $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is singular, $(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \eta)$ is no longer cosymplectic, and the equations (1) have no solution in general. Even if it exists, it will be neither unique nor a SODE. In the best of cases, these vector fields can exist only in a subset of points of J^1E , and the most interesting situation is when this subset is a submanifold of J^1E . Thus, the problem we want to solve is the following: to look for a submanifold $S \hookrightarrow J^1E$, transverse to the projection $\bar{\pi}^1: J^1E \rightarrow B$, and a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E, S)$ such that

1. $[i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}]_{\bar{y}} = 0$, and $[i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\eta]_{\bar{y}} = 1$, for every $\bar{y} \in S$.
2. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE on the points of S ; that is, $\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}})|_S = 0$.
3. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is tangent to S .

Conditions 1 and 3 are called *compatibility* and *stability* or *consistency conditions* for the dynamical equations, respectively. The problem can then be solved by first considering only these conditions and afterwards adding the second one, or taking all of them simultaneously.

3.2 Solving the dynamical Lagrangian equations. Lagrangian constraint algorithm and dynamical Lagrangian constraints

First we consider the problem of finding a submanifold $M \hookrightarrow J^1E$, transverse to the projection $\bar{\pi}^1: J^1E \rightarrow B$, and a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E, M)$ such that

1. $[i(X)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}]_{\bar{y}} = 0$, and $[i(X)\eta]_{\bar{y}} = 1$, for every $\bar{y} \in M$.
2. X is tangent to M .

To solve this problem, we apply the algorithmic procedure developed in Section 2.2, with the hypothesis there assumed. Following this process, we obtain a sequence of constrained submanifolds

$$\dots \xrightarrow{i_{r+1}^r} M_i \xrightarrow{i_r^{r-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{i_2^1} M_1 \xrightarrow{i_1} M_0 \equiv J^1E . \quad (21)$$

For every i , M_i is called the *ith Lagrangian dynamical constraint submanifold*, and this procedure will be called the *Lagrangian dynamical constraint algorithm*.

The only case that concerns us is when the algorithm ends by giving a submanifold M_f (with $\dim M_f > 0$), which is called the *final dynamical constraint submanifold* for the Lagrangian problem. In such a case, there exists a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$, tangent to M_f , such that

$$[i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}]|_{M_f} = 0 , \quad [i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\eta]|_{M_f} = 1 . \quad (22)$$

Next we wish to give an intrinsic characterization of the constraints which define the constraint submanifolds M_i . In order to do this, we apply the results stated in Section 2. First we take a connection $\bar{\nabla}$ in the fibered manifold $\bar{\pi}^1: J^1E \rightarrow B$; that is, an horizontal subbundle of $T(J^1E)$ or, what is equivalent in this case, a $\bar{\pi}^1$ -transverse vector field $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$, which can be selected such that $i(\mathcal{Y})\eta = 1$ holds.

Remark 4 It is interesting to point out that this construction can be made starting from a connection ∇ in $\pi: E \rightarrow B$ or, what is equivalent in this case, a π -transverse vector field $\mathcal{Y}_E \in \mathfrak{X}(E)$. Then this connection induces another one in the fibered manifold $\bar{\pi}^1: J^1E \rightarrow B$, which is associated with the $\bar{\pi}^1$ -transverse vector field $\mathcal{Y} = j^1\mathcal{Y}_E \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ (the canonical lifting of $\mathcal{Y}_E$ to J^1E).

Now, let $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(J^1E)$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(J^1E)$ be the forms defined as

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} := i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \quad , \quad \omega_{\mathcal{L}} := \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - \eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \quad .$$

Thus, for every submanifold M_i and every $\bar{y} \in M_i$, $T_{\bar{y}}M_i$ is a vector subspace of $T_{\bar{y}}J^1E$, and we can consider the orthogonal complement $T_{\bar{y}}^{\perp}M_i$ with respect to the couple $(\eta_{\bar{y}}, (\omega_{\mathcal{L}})_{\bar{y}})$; that is

$$T_{\bar{y}}^{\perp}M_i = [\flat_{(\eta_{\bar{y}}, (\omega_{\mathcal{L}})_{\bar{y}})}(T_{\bar{y}}M_i)]^0 = \{Y \in T_{\bar{y}}J^1E \mid [i(Y)(\omega_{\mathcal{L}})_{\bar{y}} - \eta_{\bar{y}}(i(Y)\eta_{\bar{y}})]|_{T_{\bar{y}}M_i} = 0\} \quad .$$

Note that $T_{\bar{y}}^{\perp}M_0 = \ker(\omega_{\mathcal{L}})_{\bar{y}} \cap \ker \eta_{\bar{y}}$. Denote by $\mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(M_i)$ the set of sections of the vector bundle $T^{\perp}M_i \rightarrow M_i$. Therefore, as a direct application of Proposition 1 and Theorem 3 to the present case, we have:

Theorem 4 *Let $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ be a singular Lagrangian system, and consider the sequence $\{M_i\}$ of submanifolds (21). For every $i \geq 1$, let $r_{(i-1)}, r_i$ be the ranks of the distributions $T^{\perp}M_{i-1}$ and $T_{M_i}^{\perp}M_{i-1} \cap TM_i$ respectively, and consider a local basis for $\mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(M_{i-1})$ (in a neighbourhood of a point $x \in M_i$)*

$$\{\mathcal{Z}_1^{(i-1)}, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_{r_{(i-1)}}^{(i-1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{r_{(i-1)}+1}^{(i-1)}, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_{r_i}^{(i-1)}\}$$

where $\{\mathcal{Z}_j^{(i-1)}\}_{j=1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}}$ are tangent to M_i . Finally, let $X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)} + Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)}$ be the general solution on the submanifold M_i , where $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)}$ and $Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)}$ denote the determined and the undetermined parts of the solutions, respectively.

1. The submanifold M_1 where the dynamical Lagrangian equations are compatible can be defined as the zero set of the so-called 1st-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints, $\{\zeta^{(1)}\} \subset C^{\infty}(J^1E)$, which are characterized as

$$\zeta^{(1)} = i(\mathcal{Z}^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) \quad , \quad \text{for every } \mathcal{Z}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(J^1E) \quad .$$

2. Every submanifold M_{i+1} in this sequence can be defined (in M_i) as the zero set of the so-called $(i+1)$ th-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints, $\{\zeta^{(i+1)}\} \subset C^{\infty}(J^1E)$, which are characterized in the following equivalent ways:

(a) For every $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(M_i)$,

$$\zeta^{(i+1)} = i(\mathcal{Z}^{(i)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) \quad .$$

(b) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}\}$,

$$\zeta^{(i+1)} = L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)})[i(\mathcal{Z}_j^{(i-1)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})] \quad .$$

(c) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}\}$,

$$\zeta^{(i+1)} = i([X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)}, \mathcal{Z}_j^{(i-1)}])\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} + L(\mathcal{Y})[i(\mathcal{Z}_j^{(i-1)})\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}] \quad .$$

3. For every $k \in \{r_{(i-1)} + 1, \dots, r_i\}$, the stability condition

$$0 = L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)} + Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)})[i(\mathcal{Z}_k^{(i-1)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})]|_{M_i}$$

determines (partially or totally) $Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(i-1)}$ (on M_i).

4 Hamiltonian formalism for mechanical systems

Now we consider the Hamiltonian formalism of a non-autonomous mechanical system associated with a singular Lagrangian and, in particular, the problem of finding solutions of the *Hamilton equations*.

(For more details on the jet bundle description of the Hamiltonian formalism of non-autonomous mechanical systems see, for instance, [12], [13], [17], [18], [32], [39] and [41]).

4.1 The momentum dual bundle and the Legendre map. Hyper-regular and almost regular systems

In order to associate a Hamiltonian system with a non-autonomous Lagrangian system, we first need to introduce two new elements: a suitable *dual bundle* of J^1E , and a *Legendre map*.

In the jet bundle description of non-autonomous dynamical systems, there are several choices for the momentum bundle where the covariant Hamiltonian formalism takes place (see [15] for a general review). In this work, following [6], first we take the bundle T^*E , which is called the *extended momentum dual bundle* associated with $\pi: E \rightarrow B$. The natural projections are denoted by $\sigma^1: T^*E \rightarrow E$ and $\bar{\sigma}^1: T^*E \rightarrow B$. Then, if $\Lambda_0^1 T^*E$ denotes the bundle of π -semibasic 1-forms in E , we define the bundle

$$J^{1*}E := T^*E / \Lambda_0^1 T^*E \simeq V^*(\pi)$$

which is called the *restricted momentum dual bundle* associated with $\pi: E \rightarrow B$. We denote the natural projections by $\tau^1: J^{1*}E \rightarrow E$, and $\bar{\tau}^1 := \pi \circ \tau^1: J^{1*}E \rightarrow B$. In addition, we have the canonical projection $\mu: T^*E \rightarrow J^{1*}E$.

Natural coordinates in T^*E and $J^{1*}E$ (adapted to the bundle structures) will be denoted by (t, q^ρ, p, p_ρ) and (t, q^ρ, p_ρ) , respectively. Then we also write $\tilde{\eta} := \bar{\tau}^{1*}\varpi = dt$.

The construction of the Legendre map can be made following different but equivalent ways. For instance, we can follow a procedure similar to the case of autonomous mechanics, and define this map as a “fiber derivative” of the Lagrangian density (see, for instance, [15]). Alternatively, we can define it using the theory of affine dual bundles (as in [6] and [43]). Another more simple way consists in constructing this map by means of the Poincaré-Cartan form as follows: taking into account that $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ can be seen as a 1-form on J^1E along the projection $\pi^1: J^1E \rightarrow E$, the *extended Legendre map* associated with a Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ is the C^∞ -map $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}: J^1E \rightarrow T^*E$ defined by

$$[\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}(\bar{y})](Z) = (\Theta_{\mathcal{L}})_{\bar{y}}(\bar{Z}) \quad (23)$$

where $\bar{y} \in J^1E$, $Z \in T_{\pi^1(\bar{y})}E$, and $\bar{Z} \in T_{\bar{y}}J^1E$ is such that $\pi_{*\bar{y}}(\bar{Z}_\nu) = Z_\nu$. Therefore, the restricted Legendre map associated with a Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ is the C^∞ -map $\mathcal{FL}: J^1E \rightarrow J^{1*}E$ defined by

$$\mathcal{FL} := \mu \circ \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}$$

In natural coordinates, the local expressions of these Legendre maps are

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}^* t &= t & , & & \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}^* q^\rho &= q^\rho & , & & \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}^* p_\rho &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho} & , & & \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}^* p &= \mathcal{L} - v^\rho \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho} \\ \mathcal{FL}^* t &= t & , & & \mathcal{FL}^* q^\rho &= q^\rho & , & & \mathcal{FL}^* p_\rho &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The cotangent bundle T^*E is endowed with canonical forms: the *Liouville forms* $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*E)$ and $\Omega := -d\Theta \in \Omega^2(T^*E)$ (which is a symplectic form), whose local expressions are

$$\Theta = p dt + p_\nu dq^\nu, \quad \Omega = -dp \wedge dt - dp_\nu \wedge dq^\nu.$$

Using (20) and (24), we obtain that

$$\mathcal{FL}^*\Theta = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \mathcal{FL}^*\Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}. \quad (25)$$

The matrix of the tangent map $\mathcal{FL}_*$ in a natural coordinate system is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial t \partial v^\rho} & \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^\nu \partial v^\rho} & \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\nu \partial v^\rho} \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

where the sub-matrix $\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\nu \partial v^\rho} \right)$ is the *partial Hessian matrix* of $\mathcal{L}$. Thus, one deduces that (see [32])

$$\ker \mathcal{FL}_* = \ker \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_* = \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathfrak{X}^{V(\pi^1)}(J^1 E) \quad (27)$$

Note that the Lagrangian system $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is *regular*, that is, $(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \eta)$ is a cosymplectic structure (or equivalently the partial Hessian matrix $\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\nu \partial v^\rho} \right)$ is regular everywhere in $J^1 E$) if and only if $\mathcal{FL}$ is a local diffeomorphism (see also [6] for a different definition of this concept). Then, following a well-known terminology in mechanics we define:

Definition 1 *Let $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ be a Lagrangian system.*

1. $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is said to be a *regular or non-degenerate Lagrangian system* if $\mathcal{FL}$ is a local diffeomorphism.

As a particular case, $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is said to be a hyper-regular Lagrangian system if $\mathcal{FL}$ is a global diffeomorphism.

2. Elsewhere $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is said to be a *singular or degenerate Lagrangian system*.

Proposition 4 (See [15, 32]). *Let $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ be a hyper-regular Lagrangian system. Then:*

1. $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}(J^1 E)$ is a 1-codimensional embedded submanifold of T^*E which is transverse to the projection μ .
2. The map $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}$ is a diffeomorphism on its image, and the map μ restricted to $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}(J^1 E)$ is also a diffeomorphism.

For dealing with singular Lagrangians we must assume minimal “regularity” conditions. Hence we introduce the following terminology:

Definition 2 [10, 32] *A singular Lagrangian system $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is said to be almost regular if:*

1. $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} := \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}(J^1E)$ is a regular submanifold of T^*E .
(We will denote by $\tilde{j}_0: \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \hookrightarrow T^*E$ the corresponding embedding).
2. $\tilde{\mathcal{FL}}$ is a submersion onto its image (with connected fibers).
3. For every $\bar{y} \in J^1E$, the fibers $\mathcal{FL}^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}(\bar{y}))$ are connected submanifolds of $J^{1*}E$.

(This definition is slightly different from that in references [17], and [40]).

Let $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ be an almost regular Lagrangian system. Denote

$$\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{FL}(J^1E) .$$

Then let $j_0: \mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow J^{1*}E$ be the canonical inclusion, and $\mu_0: \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ the restriction of the map μ . Finally, define the restriction mappings

$$\mathcal{FL}_0: J^1E \rightarrow \mathcal{P} , \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0: J^1E \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}} .$$

With these definitions, it follows that

Proposition 5 (See [15, 32]). *Let $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ be an almost regular Lagrangian system. Then:*

1. For every $\bar{y} \in J^1E$,
$$\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0(\bar{y})) = \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y})) .$$
2. There exists a unique differentiable structure on $\mathcal{P}$ such that $\mu_0: \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is a diffeomorphism.
3. $\mathcal{P}$ is a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$, and $j_0: \mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow J^{1*}E$ is an embedding.
4. The restriction mapping $\mathcal{FL}_0: J^1E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is a submersion with connected fibers.

4.2 Hamiltonian system associated with an almost regular Lagrangian system

If $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is an almost regular Lagrangian system, the submanifold $j_0: \mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow J^{1*}E$, is a fiber manifold over E (and B). The corresponding projections will be denoted $\tau_0^1: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow E$ and $\bar{\tau}_0^1: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow B$, satisfying that $\tau^1 \circ j_0 = \tau_0^1$ and $\bar{\tau}^1 \circ j_0 = \bar{\tau}_0^1$. We will denote $\eta^0 := \bar{\tau}_0^{1*}\varpi \equiv dt$.

Now, given the diffeomorphism $h_0 = \mu_0^{-1}$, we define the Hamilton-Cartan forms

$$\Theta_{h_0} = (\tilde{j}_0 \circ h_0)^*\Theta \quad ; \quad \Omega_{h_0} = -d\Theta_{h_0} = (\tilde{j}_0 \circ h_0)^*\Omega$$

and, taking into account the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{j_0} & J^{1*}E \\ & \nearrow \mathcal{FL}_0 & \uparrow \mu_0 \downarrow h_0 & & \uparrow \mu \\ J^1E & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0} & \tilde{\mathcal{P}} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{j}_0} & T^*E \end{array}$$

from (25) we obtain that the following relations hold

$$\mathcal{FL}_0^*\Theta_{h_0} = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \quad , \quad \mathcal{FL}_0^*\Omega_{h_0} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} . \tag{28}$$

Then $(J^{1*}E, \mathcal{P}, \Omega_{h_0})$ is the *Hamiltonian system* associated with the almost regular Lagrangian system $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$.

We can state a variational problem for $(J^{1*}E, \mathcal{P}, \Omega_{h_0})$ (*Hamilton-Jacobi principle*): in a way analogous to the Lagrangian formalism, now using sections of $\bar{\tau}_0^1: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow B$, and the form Θ_{h_0} . So we look for sections $\psi_0 \in \Gamma_c(B, \mathcal{P})$ which are critical for the functional $\mathbf{H}^0(\psi) := \int_B \psi^* \Theta_{h_0}$, for every $\psi \in \Gamma_c(B, \mathcal{P})$. Therefore, it can be proved that the critical sections of the Hamilton-Jacobi variational principle are the integral curves of a vector field $X_{h_0} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P})$ (which is called a *Hamiltonian vector field* for the system $(J^{1*}E, \mathcal{P}, \Omega_{h_0})$) satisfying that:

$$i(X_{h_0})\Omega_{h_0} = 0 \quad , \quad i(X_{h_0})\eta^0 \neq 0 \quad .$$

As above, the second equation means that the vector field X_{h_0} is $\bar{\tau}_0^1$ -transverse, and we will take this condition in the form

$$i(X_{h_0})\eta^0 = 1 \quad .$$

Now, as $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is almost regular and (Ω_{h_0}, η^0) is no longer cosymplectic, the above equations have no solution in general. In the most favourable cases, Hamiltonian vector fields for $(J^{1*}E, \mathcal{P}, \Omega_{h_0})$ can exist only in a subset of points of $\mathcal{P}$, and the most interesting situation is when this subset is a submanifold of $\mathcal{P}$.

Remark 5 The construction of a Hamiltonian system associated with a hyper-regular Lagrangian system $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ follows the same pattern, but now $\mathcal{P} \equiv J^{1*}E$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \equiv T^*E$, and $\mathcal{FL}$ is a diffeomorphism. Then, the Hamiltonian section is now

$$h_0 := \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}} \circ \mathcal{FL}^{-1}$$

which is a diffeomorphism connecting $J^{1*}E$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}(J^1E)$ (observe that it is just the inverse of μ restricted to $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}(J^1E)$). (See [32] for details).

4.3 Hamiltonian constraint algorithm and equivalence with the Lagrangian formalism

The problem we want to solve is the following: to look for a submanifold $P \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}$, transverse to the projection $\bar{\tau}_0^1: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow B$, and a vector field $X_{h_0} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P}, P)$ such that

1. $[i(X_{h_0})\Omega_{h_0}]_{\tilde{y}} = 0$, and $[i(X_{h_0})\eta^0]_{\tilde{y}} = 1$, for every $\tilde{y} \in P$.
2. X_{h_0} is tangent to P .

Item 1 is the *compatibility condition*, and item 2 is the *stability* or *consistency condition* for the Hamiltonian equations.

Once again we apply the algorithmic procedure developed in Section 2.2, with the hypothesis there assumed. Thus, following this process, we obtain a sequence of constrained submanifolds

$$\dots \xrightarrow{J_{i+1}^i} P_i \xrightarrow{J_i^{i-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{J_2^1} P_1 \xrightarrow{J_1^0} P_0 \equiv \mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{J_0^0} J^{1*}E \quad . \quad (29)$$

For every i , P_i is called the $(i+1)$ th *Hamiltonian constraint submanifold*, and this procedure is called the *Hamiltonian constraint algorithm*.

The only case interesting for us is when the algorithm ends giving a submanifold P_f (with $\dim P_f > 0$), which is called the *final constraint submanifold* for the Hamiltonian problem. Then, there exists a vector field $X_{h_0} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P}, P)$, tangent to P_f , such that

$$[i(X_{h_0})\Omega_{h_0}]|_{P_f} = 0, \quad [i(X_{h_0})\eta^0]|_{P_f} = 1. \quad (30)$$

Now, consider the sequences of dynamical Lagrangian constraint submanifolds (21) and of Hamiltonian constraint submanifolds (29). Then, we have (see [32]):

Theorem 5 *At every level $i = 1, \dots, f$ of the Lagrangian dynamical constraint algorithm and the Hamiltonian constraint algorithm we have:*

1. $\mathcal{FL}_{i-1}^{-1}(P_i) = M_i$ (and hence $\mathcal{FL}_{i-1}(M_i) = P_i$).
2. The induced mapping by $\mathcal{FL}_{i-1}$ from M_i to P_i , denoted by $\mathcal{FL}_i: M_i \rightarrow P_i$, is a submersion.
3. For every $\bar{y}_i \in M_i$, $\mathcal{FL}_i^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_i(\bar{y}_i)) = \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}_i))$. Hence

$$\ker(\mathcal{FL}_{i*})_{\bar{y}_i} = \ker(\mathcal{FL}_{0*})_{\bar{y}_i} = (\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathfrak{X}^{V(\pi_1)}(J^1 E))_{\bar{y}_i}.$$

4. There is a basis $\{\zeta_j^{(i)}\} \subset C^\infty(J^1 E)$ for the set of i th-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints which is $\mathcal{FL}_0$ -related with a basis $\{\xi_j^{(i)}\} \subset C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$ for the set of i th-generation Hamiltonian constraints; that is,

$$\mathcal{FL}_0^* \xi_j^{(i)} = \zeta_j^{(i)}.$$

Thus, the codimension of M_i (as a submanifold of $J^1 E$) coincides with the codimension of P_i (as a submanifold of $\mathcal{P}$).

(Proof) We make the proof for the first level ($i = 1$). For the other cases it follows the same pattern.

1. First we prove that $\mathcal{FL}_0(M_1) \subset P_1$. In fact, for every $\bar{y} \in M_1$, we have that there exists $X_{\bar{y}} \in T_{\bar{y}} J^1 E$ such that

$$i(X_{\bar{y}})(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}})_{\bar{y}} = 0, \quad i(X_{\bar{y}})\eta_{\bar{y}} = 1.$$

Thus, if $\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}) = \tilde{y}$ and $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{y}} = (\mathcal{FL}_{0*})_{\bar{y}}(X_{\bar{y}})$, then using $\mathcal{FL}_0^* \Omega_{h_0} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, and $\mathcal{FL}_0^* \eta^0 = \eta$, we obtain that

$$i(\tilde{X}_{\tilde{y}})(\Omega_{h_0})_{\tilde{y}} = 0, \quad i(\tilde{X}_{\tilde{y}})\eta_{\tilde{y}}^0 = 1$$

which implies that $\tilde{y} \in P_1$.

Conversely, for every $\tilde{y} \in P_1$, the fiber $\mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\tilde{y})$ is entirely contained in M_1 . In fact, if $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\tilde{y})$ and $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{y}} \in T_{\tilde{y}} \mathcal{P}$ is such that $i_{\tilde{X}_{\tilde{y}}} \Omega_{h_0}(\tilde{y}) = 0$ and $i_{\tilde{X}_{\tilde{y}}} \eta_{\tilde{y}}^0 = 1$, then since $\mathcal{FL}_0$ is a submersion, there exists $X_{\bar{y}} \in T_{\bar{y}} J^1 E$ satisfying $(\mathcal{FL}_{0*})_{\bar{y}}(X_{\bar{y}}) = \tilde{X}_{\tilde{y}}$ and, reasoning as above, we conclude that $i_{X_{\bar{y}}} \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{y}) = 0$, $i_{X_{\bar{y}}} \eta_{\bar{y}} = 1$. Thus, $\bar{y} \in M_1$ and therefore $\mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(P_1) \subseteq M_1$.

As a consequence of both results we obtain that $\mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(P_1) = M_1$, and consequently $\mathcal{FL}_0(M_1) = P_1$.

2. For every $\tilde{y} \in P_1$, as $\mathcal{FL}_0$ is a submersion, then there exists an open neighborhood $U_0 \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ with $\tilde{y} \in U_0$, and a differentiable mapping $s_0: U_0 \rightarrow J^1E$, such that $\mathcal{FL}_0 \circ s_0 = \text{Id}_{U_0}$. We take $U_1 = U_0 \cap P_1$, and $s_1 = s_0|_{U_1}: U_1 \rightarrow J^1E$ is a differentiable mapping.

If $\tilde{y}' \in U_1$, then there exists $\bar{y}' \in M_1$ such that $\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}') = \tilde{y}'$, so $\mathcal{FL}_0(s_1(\tilde{y}')) = \mathcal{FL}_0[s_0(\tilde{y}')] = \tilde{y}' = \mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}')$. Therefore, $s_1(\tilde{y}') \in \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}')) \subseteq M_1$. That is, $s_1: U_1 \rightarrow J^1E$ takes values in M_1 , and because M_1 is supposed to be an embedded submanifold of J^1E , then $s_2: U_1 \rightarrow M_1$ is also a differentiable mapping. Moreover, $\mathcal{FL}_1 \circ s_1 = \text{Id}_{U_1}$. Then, $s_1: U_1 \rightarrow M_1$ is a local section of $\mathcal{FL}_1: M_1 \rightarrow P_1$ in $\tilde{y} \in P_1$, and therefore $\mathcal{FL}_1$ is a submersion.

3. Using the first item we deduce that $\mathcal{FL}_i^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_i(\bar{y}_i)) = \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}_i))$ and therefore

$$\ker(\mathcal{FL}_{i*})_{\bar{y}_i} = \ker(\mathcal{FL}_{0*})_{\bar{y}_i}.$$

Furthermore, in [32], it was proved that

$$\ker(\mathcal{FL}_{0*}) = \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathfrak{X}^{V(\pi_1)}(J^1E).$$

4. We have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J^1E & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FL}_0} & \mathcal{P} \\ \uparrow \imath_1 & & \uparrow \jmath_1 \\ M_1 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FL}_1} & P_1 \end{array}$$

Consider the basis $\{\xi_j^{(1)}\}$ of 1st-generation Hamiltonian constraints, we must prove that the set $\{\mathcal{FL}_0^* \xi_j^{(1)} \equiv \zeta_j^{(1)}\}$ is a basis of 1st-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints. First observe that, as $\jmath_1^* \xi_j^{(1)} = 0$, we obtain that

$$0 = \mathcal{FL}_1^* \jmath_1^* \xi_j^{(1)} = \imath_1^* \mathcal{FL}_0^* \xi_j^{(1)} \equiv \imath_1^* \zeta_j^{(1)}$$

and thus the functions $\zeta_j^{(1)}$ are dynamical Lagrangian constraints. Furthermore, the number of independent 1st-generation Hamiltonian constraints is $\dim \mathcal{P} - \dim P_1 \equiv r$. If m is the dimension of the fibers of $\mathcal{FL}_0$, then $\dim J^1E = \dim J^{1*}E = \dim \mathcal{P} + m$, and as a consequence of the items 1 and 3, $\dim M_1 = \dim P_1 + m$. Therefore, the number of independent 1st-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints is

$$\dim J^1E - \dim M_1 = \dim \mathcal{P} + m - \dim P_1 - m = r.$$

Notice that the constraints are independent because $\mathcal{FL}$ is a submersion and thus $\mathcal{FL}_0^*$ is injective. ■

In this way we can draw the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M_0 = J^1E & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FL}_0} & \mathcal{P} \equiv P_0 & \xrightarrow{i_0} & J^{1*}E \\ \uparrow \imath_1 & & \uparrow \jmath_1 & & \\ M_1 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FL}_1} & P_1 & & \\ \uparrow \imath_2^1 & & \uparrow \jmath_2^1 & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \\ \uparrow \imath_{f-1}^{f-2} & & \uparrow \jmath_{f-1}^{f-2} & & \\ M_{f-1} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FL}_{f-1}} & P_{f-1} & & \\ \uparrow \imath_f^{f-1} & & \uparrow \jmath_f^{f-1} & & \\ M_f & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FL}_f} & P_f & & \end{array} \quad (31)$$

Finally, for the vector fields solutions of the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian dynamical problems we have:

Theorem 6 *Let M_f be the final dynamical constraint submanifold for the Lagrangian problem, and P_f is the final constraint submanifold for the Hamiltonian counterpart.*

1. *Let $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E, M_f)$ such that:*

- (a) *$X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is tangent to M_f .*
- (b) *$X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution of the dynamical Lagrangian equations (22).*
- (c) *$X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable.*

Then $\mathcal{FL}_{f}X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_{h_0} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^{1*}E, P_f)$ is tangent to P_f and it is a solution of the Hamiltonian equations (30).*

2. *Conversely, if X_{h_0} is a vector field tangent to P_f and it is a solution of the Hamiltonian equations (30), then there exists a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ on M_f such that $\mathcal{FL}_{f*}X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_{h_0}$, and it is a solution of the dynamical Lagrangian equations (22).*

(Proof) The results follow using (28), that $\mathcal{FL}_f : M_f \rightarrow P_f$ is a surjective submersion and the fact that $\mathcal{FL}_0^*\eta^0 = \eta$ (see [32]). ■

In this case, the integral curves of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ are not, in general, the solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations, since they are not holonomic ($X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is not a SODE, necessarily). The problem of finding a solution satisfying the SODE condition, that is, an Euler-Lagrange vector field, is studied in Section 4.5.

4.4 Intrinsic characterization of Hamiltonian constraints

We want to give an intrinsic characterization of the Hamiltonian constraints which define the constraint submanifolds P_i , and hence we will apply again the results given in Sections 2.1 and 2.2. First we take a connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ in $\tilde{\tau}_0^1: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow B$ or, what is equivalent, a $\tilde{\tau}_0^1$ -transverse vector field $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P})$, which can be selected such that $i(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}})\eta^0 = 1$ holds.

The connections $\tilde{\nabla}$ in $\tilde{\tau}_0^1: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow B$, and $\bar{\nabla}$ in $\bar{\pi}^1: J^1E \rightarrow B$ (given in Section 3.2) can be chosen $\mathcal{FL}_0$ -related. This means that the vector field $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ associated with $\bar{\nabla}$ can be selected in such a way that $\mathcal{FL}_{0*}\mathcal{Y} = \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$. This is always possible, since $\mathcal{FL}_0$ is a surjective submersion. From now on this fact will be assumed.

In this case, $\tilde{\nabla}$ can be constructed starting from a connection ∇ in $\pi: E \rightarrow B$, as in the Lagrangian case.

Observe also that since $\mathcal{FL}_0^*\eta^0 = \eta$, if $i(\mathcal{Y})\eta = 1$, then $i(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}})\eta^0 = 1$ too.

Now, let $\gamma_{h_0} \in \Omega^1(J^{1*}E)$ and $\omega_{h_0} \in \Omega^2(J^{1*}E)$ be the forms defined as

$$\gamma_{h_0} := i(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}})\Omega_{h_0} \quad , \quad \omega_{h_0} := \Omega_{h_0} - \eta^0 \wedge \gamma_{h_0} .$$

Using (28) and after the comment in the first item above, it is obvious that

$$\mathcal{FL}_0^*\omega_{h_0} = \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \quad , \quad \mathcal{FL}_0^*\gamma_{h_0} = \gamma_{\mathcal{L}} . \tag{32}$$

Suppose that $\bar{y}_i \in M_i$ (respectively, $\bar{y}_{i+1} \in M_{i+1}$) and that $\tilde{y}_i = \mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}_i)$ (respectively, $\tilde{y}_{i+1} = \mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}_{i+1})$). Using (32) and the fact that $\mathcal{FL}_0^*(\eta^0) = \eta = (\bar{\pi}^1)^*(\varpi)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{FL}_0^*)_{\bar{y}_i}(\mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_i}^\perp M_i) &= \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{y}_i}^\perp P_i \\ (\mathcal{FL}_0^*)_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}(\mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_i \cap \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_{i+1}) &= \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{y}_{i+1}}^\perp P_i \cap \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{y}_{i+1}}^\perp P_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from Lemmas 12 and 17 (see Appendices A and C) and Theorem 5, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \ker(\mathcal{FL}_0^*)_{\bar{y}_i} &\subseteq (\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta)_{\bar{y}_i} \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_i}^\perp M_0 \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_i}^\perp M_i, \\ \ker(\mathcal{FL}_0^*)_{\bar{y}_i} &\subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_0 \cap \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_{i+1} \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_i \cap \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if m is the dimension of the fibers of $\mathcal{FL}_0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_i}^\perp M_i &= \dim \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{y}_i}^\perp P_i + m \\ \dim(\mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_i \cap \mathbb{T}_{\bar{y}_{i+1}}^\perp M_{i+1}) &= \dim(\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{y}_{i+1}}^\perp P_i \cap \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{y}_{i+1}}^\perp P_{i+1}) + m. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that the rank of the distributions $\mathbb{T}^\perp M_i$ and $\mathbb{T}_{M_{i+1}}^\perp M_i \cap \mathbb{T} M_{i+1}$ is constant if and only if the rank of the distributions $\mathbb{T}^\perp P_i$ and $\mathbb{T}_{P_{i+1}}^\perp P_i \cap \mathbb{T} P_{i+1}$ is constant. We will assume that the distributions $\mathbb{T}^\perp P_i$ and $\mathbb{T}_{P_{i+1}}^\perp P_i \cap \mathbb{T} P_{i+1}$ have constant rank.

Denote by $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(P_i)$ the set of sections of the vector bundle $\mathbb{T}^\perp P_i \rightarrow P_i$. Then, as a direct application of Proposition 1 and Theorem 3 to the present case, we have:

Theorem 7 *Let (J^1^*E, Ω_{h_0}) be the Hamiltonian system associated with an almost regular Lagrangian system, and consider the sequence $\{P_i\}$ of submanifolds (29). For every $i \geq 1$, let $r_{(i-1)}, r_i$ be the ranks of the distributions $\mathbb{T}^\perp P_{i-1}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{P_i}^\perp P_{i-1} \cap \mathbb{T} P_i$ respectively, and consider a local basis for $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(P_{i-1})$ (in a neighbourhood of a point $x \in P_i$)*

$$\{\tilde{Z}_1^{(i-1)}, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{r_{(i-1)}}^{(i-1)}, \tilde{Z}_{r_{(i-1)}+1}^{(i-1)}, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{r_i}^{(i-1)}\}$$

where $\{\tilde{Z}_j^{(i-1)}\}_{j=1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}}$ are tangent to P_i . Finally, let $X_{h_0} = X_{h_0}^{(i-1)} + Y_{h_0}^{(i-1)}$ be the general solution on the submanifold P_i , where $X_{h_0}^{(i-1)}$ and $Y_{h_0}^{(i-1)}$ denote the determined and the undetermined parts of the solutions, respectively.

1. The submanifold P_1 , where the Hamiltonian equations are compatible can be defined as the zero set of the so-called 1st-generation Hamiltonian constraints, $\{\xi^{(1)}\} \subset C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$, which are characterized as

$$\xi^{(1)} = i(\tilde{Z}^{(0)})(\eta^0 - \gamma_{h_0}), \text{ for every } \tilde{Z}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(\mathcal{P}).$$

2. Every submanifold P_{i+1} in this sequence can be defined (in P_i) as the zero set of the so-called $(i+1)$ th-generation Hamiltonian constraints, $\{\xi^{(i+1)}\} \subset C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$, which are characterized in the following equivalent ways:

$$(a) \text{ For every } \tilde{Z}^{(i)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(P_i), \quad \xi^{(i+1)} = i(\tilde{Z}^{(i)})(\eta^0 - \gamma_{h_0}).$$

$$(b) \text{ For every } j \in \{1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}\},$$

$$\xi^{(i+1)} = L(X_{h_0}^{(i-1)})[i(\tilde{Z}_j^{(i-1)})(\eta^0 - \gamma_{h_0})].$$

(c) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, r_{(i-1)}\}$,

$$\xi^{(i+1)} = i([X_{h_0}^{(i-1)}, \tilde{Z}_j^{(i-1)}])\gamma_{h_0} + L(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}})[i(\tilde{Z}_j^{(i-1)})\gamma_{h_0}] .$$

3. For every $k \in \{r_{(i-1)} + 1, \dots, r_i\}$ the stability condition

$$0 = L(X_{h_0}^{(i-1)} + Y_{h_0}^{(i-1)})[i(\tilde{Z}_k^{(i-1)})(\eta^0 - \gamma_{h_0})]|_P$$

determines (partially or totally) $Y_{h_0}^{(i-1)}$ (on P_i).

4.5 The second order differential equation problem

Assume that $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is an almost regular Lagrangian system and that M_f is the final constraint submanifold (in the Lagrangian setting). Then there exists a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^f$ on M_f such that $i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^f)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}|_{M_f} = 0$, and $i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^f)\eta|_{M_f} = 1$. But $X_{\mathcal{L}}^f$ will not in general be a SODE on M_f , and thus the integral curves of $X_{\mathcal{L}}^f$ will not satisfy, in general, the Euler-Lagrange equations. In order to solve this problem, we will construct a submanifold S of M_f where there exists a unique vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^S$ such that $X_{\mathcal{L}}^S$ is a SODE on S and

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^S)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}|_S = 0 \quad , \quad i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^S)\eta|_S = 1.$$

From Theorem 6, we know that we can choose the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^f$ on M_f such that it projects via $\mathcal{FL}_f$ onto a vector field $X_{h_0}^f$ on P_f . Then we consider the subset S of M_f defined by

$$S = \{\bar{x} \in M_f / (\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^f))(\bar{x}) = 0\}. \quad (33)$$

In [32], it was proved that

$$\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^f)(\bar{x}) \in \ker(\mathcal{FL}_f)_{*\bar{x}} = \ker(\mathcal{FL}_0)_{*\bar{x}}, \quad \text{for every } \bar{x} \in M_f \quad (34)$$

and that for every $\bar{x} \in M_f$, $S \cap \mathcal{FL}_f^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_f(\bar{x})) = S \cap \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{x}))$ is a point $s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f}(\tilde{x})$. This point is characterized by the condition

$$\iota(s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f}(\tilde{x})) = (\bar{\pi}^1)_{*x}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^f(\bar{x})),$$

where $\iota : J^1E \rightarrow TE$ is the canonical embedding (see Section 3.1).

The above result allows us to introduce a well-defined map $s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f} : P_f \rightarrow M_f$ such that $S = s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f}(P_f)$ and $\mathcal{FL}_f \circ s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f} = Id$. In fact, $s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f} : P_f \rightarrow M_f$ is a global section of the submersion $\mathcal{FL}_f : M_f \rightarrow P_f$ and therefore S is an embedded submanifold of M_f and the map $s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f} : P_f \rightarrow S$ is a diffeomorphism (for more details, see [32]).

Moreover, we have

Theorem 8 [32]

1. There exists a unique vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^S = (s_{X_{\mathcal{L}}^f})_*(X_{h_0}^f)$ tangent to S which satisfies the following conditions

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^S)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}|_S = 0 \quad , \quad i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^S)\eta|_S = 1 \quad , \quad \mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^S)|_S = 0.$$

2. The integral sections of $X_{\mathcal{L}}^S$ satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equations.

Next, we will give a local description of the submanifold S and of the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^S$.

If m is the dimension of the fibers of the submersion $\mathcal{FL}_0 : J^1E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ then it is clear that the rank of the partial Hessian matrix $\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\nu \partial v^\rho}\right)$ is $n - m$ (see (26)). We can suppose without loss of the generality, that the first $n - m$ rows of this matrix are independent. With this hypothesis and using (26), we deduce that for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ there exist local real functions $\{W_j^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n-m}$ such that $\{W_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ is a local basis of $\ker(\mathcal{FL}_0)_*$, where

$$W_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^{n-m+j}} + W_j^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}, \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, m\}. \quad (35)$$

Now, if

$$X_{\mathcal{L}}^f = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + A^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + \bar{A}^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$$

then, since $X_{\mathcal{L}}^f$ is $\mathcal{FL}_f$ -projectable, it follows that the functions A^i are constant on the fibers of $\mathcal{FL}_f : M_f \rightarrow P_f$. But, as $\mathcal{FL}_f^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_f(\bar{x})) = \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{x}))$ for every $\bar{x} \in M_f$ (see Theorem 5), we obtain that

$$W_j|_{M_f}(A^i) = 0, \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \text{ and } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (36)$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^f) = (A^i - v^i) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}.$$

Thus, from (34) and (35), we have that

$$\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^f) = (A^{n-m+j} - v^{n-m+j})W_j|_{M_f}. \quad (37)$$

Note that the functions

$$\xi_j^S = A^{n-m+j} - v^{n-m+j}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m$$

are independent on M_f . In fact (see (33) and (36)),

$$d\xi_j^S(W_i|_{P_f}) = -\delta_{ij}.$$

Moreover, using (33) and (37), we conclude that $\{\xi_j^S\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ is a set of local independent constraint functions defining S as a submanifold of M_f , that is,

$$S = \{\bar{x} \in M_f / (A^{n-m+j} - v^{n-m+j})(\bar{x}) = 0, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}\}.$$

Finally, a direct computation proves that the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^S$ on S is given by

$$X_{\mathcal{L}}^S = X_{\mathcal{L}}^f|_S - X_{\mathcal{L}}^f|_S(\xi_j^S)W_j|_S = X_{\mathcal{L}}^f|_S - (X_{\mathcal{L}}^f|_S(A^{n-m+j}) - \bar{A}^{n-m+j})W_j|_S.$$

5 Finding Euler-Lagrange vector fields. Dynamical and SODE Lagrangian constraints

In Section 4.5 it was shown that there exists an embedded submanifold S of M_f and a unique vector field tangent to S which is a SODE and verifies the Euler-Lagrange equations. However, there is another different approach, consisting in imposing the SODE condition on each step of the constraint algorithm. Next we will develop this procedure, which is a generalization of the method given in [38] for autonomous Lagrangian systems (see also [9]).

5.1 SODE condition: SODE first order generation constraints

In Section 3 we have applied the results of Section 2 to obtain a constraint submanifold M_1 such that there exist vector fields $\{X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}, Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} \in \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta\}$ satisfying the dynamical Lagrangian equations (1) or, equivalently,

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\omega_{\mathcal{L}}|_{M_1} = -\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}|_{M_1} \quad , \quad i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\eta|_{M_1} = 1 . \quad (38)$$

However, in general, these solutions on the constrained submanifold M_1 do not satisfy the SODE condition on M_1 . Hence, we will look for the points in M_1 where such a solution exists.

Thus, we consider the submanifold

$$S_1 = \{\bar{x} \in M_1 \mid \exists \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} \in \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta \text{ such that } (\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}))(\bar{x}) = 0\} .$$

That is, S_1 is the maximal set of points of M_1 where there exist a vector field $D = X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E; S_1)$ such that

- (a) $i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}}|_{S_1} = -\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}|_{S_1}$, $i(D)\eta|_{S_1} = 1$, and
- (b) D satisfies the SODE condition on S_1 ($\mathcal{J}(D)|_{S_1} = 0$ and $i(D)\eta|_{S_1} = 1$).

Notice that, if $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ is a vector field satisfying (a) and (b), and $W \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$, then $D + W$ satisfies (a) and (b) too. In particular, since $\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta \subset \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta$, then $\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1 \subset \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$. Hence, if $W \in \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$, $D + W$ also satisfies (a) and (b). Conversely, if D_1 and D_2 satisfy (a) and (b), then $D_1 - D_2$ is an element of $\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1 \subset \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$.

Now, we are going to describe the submanifold S_1 inside M_1 as the vanishing of a family of functions. For this purpose, we will use a particular kind of connections:

Definition 3 A connection $\bar{\nabla} = \eta \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ in $\bar{\pi}^1: J^1 E \rightarrow B$ is said to be a second-order connection if $\mathcal{Y}$ is a SODE.

For second-order connections, we will prove the following results:

Lemma 2 Let $\bar{\nabla} = \eta \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ be a second order connection in the fibered manifold $\bar{\pi}^1: J^1 E \rightarrow B$. Then the 2-form $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - \eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ satisfies

$$\omega_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{J}(X), Y) + \omega_{\mathcal{L}}(X, \mathcal{J}(Y)) = 0 ,$$

for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$.

(Proof) First, notice that for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$, $i(\mathcal{J}(X))\eta = 0$ (as $\mathcal{J}(X) \in \ker \pi_*^1$). Moreover, we know that for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ we have $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{J}(X), Y) + \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}(X, \mathcal{J}(Y)) = 0$ (see [25]), hence

$$i(\mathcal{J}(X))\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = i(\mathcal{J}(X))i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -i(X)i(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Y}))\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$$

since $\mathcal{J}(Y) = 0$ ($\mathcal{Y}$ is a SODE). Then, $(\eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})(\mathcal{J}(X), Y) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\omega_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{J}(X), Y) = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{J}(X), Y) + (\eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})(\mathcal{J}(X), Y) = -\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}(X, \mathcal{J}(Y)) = -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}(X, \mathcal{J}(Y)) .$$

■

Lemma 3 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the subset of $\mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ defined by*

$$\mathcal{M} = \{Z \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E) \mid \mathcal{J}(Z) \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*\}$$

and assume that the connection $\bar{\nabla} = \eta \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ is of second order ($\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$). Then, given $X \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ verifying $i(X)i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for every $Z \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists a π^1 -vertical vector field V such that $X - V \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$. Such a vector field V is unique up to an element of $\ker \mathcal{FL}_$.*

(*Proof*) Recall that $\ker \mathcal{FL}_* = \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$. First, notice that if $\bar{\nabla}$ is a second order connection, then $\ker \mathcal{FL}_* = \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1 = \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$. We know that $\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1 \subset \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$. But if $V \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$, then there exists a vector field $U \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ such that $\mathcal{J}(U) = V$ (V is π^1 -vertical). Then

$$\begin{aligned} i(V)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= i(V)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(V)(\eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = -(i(V)i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}})\eta \\ &= -(i(\mathcal{J}(U))i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}})\eta = (i(U)i(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Y}))\Omega_{\mathcal{L}})\eta = 0 \end{aligned}$$

(since $\mathcal{Y}$ is of second order).

Now, given an arbitrary vector field X , the necessary and sufficient condition for the equation $i(V)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = i(X)\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ to be solved for a π^1 -vertical vector field $V \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ is that for every $U \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ verifying $i(U)i(V)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ (with V a π^1 -vertical vector field), then $i(U)i(X)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. Now, notice that, if $i(U)i(V)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for every V , then $i(U)i(\mathcal{J}(Y))\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -i(\mathcal{J}(U))i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for every $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$; that is, $U \in \mathcal{M}$. Therefore, if X verifies $i(X)i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for $Z \in \mathcal{M}$, then $i(U)i(X)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and equation $i(V)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = i(X)\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ has solution. Finally, for every couple V_1, V_2 of such π^1 -vertical fields, their difference is π^1 -vertical and belongs to $\ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$. ■

Lemma 4 *Let $\mathcal{M}'$ be the subset of $\mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ defined by*

$$\mathcal{M}' = \{Z \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E) \mid Z \in \ker \bar{\pi}_*^1 \text{ and } \mathcal{J}(Z) \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*\}$$

and let $\bar{\nabla} = \eta \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ be a second order connection. Then for every $X \in \ker \bar{\pi}_^1$ verifying $i(X)i(Z')\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for every $Z' \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists a $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical vector field V (unique up to an element of $\ker \mathcal{FL}_*$) such that $X - V \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$.*

(*Proof*) First, notice that if V is a π^1 -vertical vector field, then there exists a $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical vector field Y' such that $\mathcal{J}(Y') = V$: if $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ is such that $\mathcal{J}(Y) = V$ and D is an arbitrary SODE, then the vector field $Y' = Y - (i(Y)\eta)D$ is $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical and $\mathcal{J}(Y') = V$. Now, the proof is similar to that of the above lemma, simply observing that, if $i(U)i(V)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for every V π^1 -vertical, then $i(U)i(\mathcal{J}(Y'))\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -i(\mathcal{J}(U))i(Y')\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for every $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical vector field Y' , that is, $U \in \mathcal{M}'$. ■

Now, we have the following.

Proposition 6 *Let $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E)$ be such that $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y$ satisfies the SODE condition; that is, $\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y) = 0$ and $i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y)\eta = 1$, and let $\bar{\nabla}$ be a second order connection. Then*

$$S_1 = \{\bar{x} \in M_1 \mid (i(Z)i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}})(\bar{x}) = 0, \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}\},$$

(*Proof*) Consider the set $C = \{\bar{x} \in M_1 \mid (i(Z)i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}})(\bar{x}) = 0, \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}\}$. Then the proof can be done in three steps:

1. C is independent of the chosen vector field Y .

Take $T = Y_1 - Y_2$, where Y_1 and Y_2 verify that $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y_i$ are SODE for every $i = 1, 2$. Then T is a π_1 -vertical vector field. So there exists a vector field $U \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ such that $T = \mathcal{J}(U)$. Now, using Lemma 2 we have

$$\omega_{\mathcal{L}}(T, Z) = \omega_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{J}(U), Z) = -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}(U, \mathcal{J}(Z)) = 0,$$

since $\mathcal{J}(Z) \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_* = \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1 = \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$.

2. $C \subset S_1$.

Let $\bar{x} \in C$, then $(i(Z)i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}})(\bar{x}) = 0$ for every $Z \in \mathcal{M}$. From Lemma 3 we know that at each point $\bar{x} \in C$, there exists a π^1 -vertical vector v such that $Y_{\bar{x}} - v \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}}|_{\bar{x}}$. Hence $(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y)_{\bar{x}} - v = (X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})_{\bar{x}} + (Y_{\bar{x}} - v)$ is of second order on M_1 , and it is also a solution on M_1 , so $\bar{x} \in S_1$.

3. $S_1 \subset C$.

Let $\bar{x} \in S_1$. Then there exists $\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} \in \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta \subset \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta$ such that $(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})_{\bar{x}}$ is a solution of the dynamical equations and satisfies the SODE condition on S_1 . In general $\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})_{\bar{x}} \neq 0$ for $\bar{x} \notin S_1$, but a new vector field Y can be constructed such that $Y_{\bar{x}} = (\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})_{\bar{x}}$, if $\bar{x} \in S_1$, and $[\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y)]_{\bar{x}} = 0$, for every $\bar{x} \in J^1E$. Then $(i(Z)i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}})(\bar{x}) = 0$, for every $\bar{x} \in S_1$ (since $[i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}}](\bar{x}) = [i(\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\omega_{\mathcal{L}}](\bar{x}) = 0$, for every $\bar{x} \in S_1$), so $\bar{x} \in C$. ■

Corollary 3 *With the hypothesis of the above proposition, for every SODE D we have*

$$S_1 = \{\bar{x} \in M_1 \mid (i(Z)i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} - D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}})(\bar{x}) = 0, \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

(Proof) As $Y = X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} - D$, the proof is trivial. ■

Given $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$, such that $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y$ satisfies the SODE condition, for every $Z \in \mathcal{M}$, the function

$$\phi^{(1)} := i(Z)i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} \in C^\infty(J^1E)$$

(or equivalently $\phi^{(1)} = i(Z)i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} - D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, for a SODE $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$), is called a *1st-generation SODE Lagrangian constraint*.

5.2 General expressions of first order generation constraints. $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectability

Using a second order connection $\bar{\nabla}$ to make the splitting of the form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, we can give a unified description of both the dynamical and SODE Lagrangian constraints.

Theorem 9 *For any SODE D we have*

$$S_1 = \{\bar{x} \in J^1E \mid [i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})](\bar{x}) = 0, \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

The function $i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})$ is called a 1st-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints, and S_1 is called the submanifold of 1st-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints.

(*Proof*) Let $\bar{x} \in M_1$. If $D = X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y$ for an arbitrary vector field Y , then

$$[i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})](\bar{x}) = [i(Z)(i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})](\bar{x}) = [i(Z) i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}}](\bar{x})$$

which are the SODE constraints defining S_1 as a submanifold of M_1 .

Next, we prove that, if $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(J^1E)$, then $Z \in \mathcal{M}$; that is, $\mathcal{J}(Z) \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_* = \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \pi_*^1$. In fact, we know that $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(J^1E)$ if, and only if,

$$i(Z) i(U)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + (i(U)\eta)(i(Z)\eta) = 0 ,$$

for every $U \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$. Then $Z \in \mathcal{M}$ because

$$i(U) i(\mathcal{J}(Z))\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -i(\mathcal{J}(U)) i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = (i(Z)\eta)(i(\mathcal{J}(U))\eta) = 0 ,$$

Taking this into account, we obtain

$$i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = i(Z) i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = -(i(Z)\eta)(i(D)\eta) + i(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = i(Z)(\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} - \eta) ,$$

which are the dynamical constraints defining M_1 as a submanifold of J^1E . ■

Summarizing, we have arrived at a submanifold S_1 of J^1E and a family of vector fields

$$\{\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} := X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + V^{(0)}; V^{(0)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*\} \quad (39)$$

such that

$$[i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}]|_{S_1} = 0 \quad , \quad [i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\eta]|_{S_1} = 1 \quad , \quad [\mathcal{J}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})]|_{S_1} = 0 .$$

Observe that $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}$ and $\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}$ are fixed vector fields, whereas $V^{(0)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ is arbitrary.

The submanifold S_1 is characterized as

$$S_1 = \{\bar{x} \in J^1E \mid [i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})](\bar{x}) = 0, \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}\} ,$$

for any SODE D . The constraints that define S_1 are of two different kinds:

- Lagrangian dynamical constraints: $\zeta^{(1)} := i(\mathcal{Z}^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})$, $\mathcal{Z}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(J^1E)$.
- SODE Lagrangian constraints: $\phi^{(1)} := i(Z) i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, $Z \in \mathcal{M}$, $Z \notin \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(J^1E)$, $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ with $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y$ a SODE.

We know that the Lagrangian dynamical constraints can be expressed as $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable functions (Theorem 5). But this is not the situation for the SODE Lagrangian constraints, as will now be proved. First, the following results are required:

Lemma 5 *For every $V \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$, there exists $Z' \in \mathcal{M}'$ such that $\mathcal{J}(Z') = V$ and Z' is $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable.*

(*Proof*) It is evident that if $V \in \ker \pi_*^1$ is $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable, then we can choose an $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable π_*^1 -vertical vector field Y' with $\mathcal{J}(Y') = V$ (in fact, if $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is such that $\mathcal{J}(Y) = V$ and $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is a SODE. Then $Y' = Y - (i(Y)\eta)D$ and the only problem is to take the vertical parts of Y and D , which are arbitrary). In particular, for every $V \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$, we have $\mathcal{FL}_*(V) = 0$, which implies they are $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable, hence there exists some $Z' \in \mathcal{M}'$ which is $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable and $\mathcal{J}(Z') = V$. ■

Lemma 6 *If $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is a SODE, then $\mathcal{J}([V, D]) = V$, for every π^1 -vertical vector field V .*

(*Proof*) This follows by using the local expressions of the vertical endomorphism $\mathcal{J}$, a SODE and a π^1 -vertical vector field. ■

Lemma 7 *If $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is a SODE, then $[V, D] \in \mathcal{M}$, for every $V \in \mathcal{FL}_*$. Moreover,*

$$[\ker \mathcal{FL}_*, D] + \ker \pi_*^1 = \mathcal{M}' .$$

(*Proof*) The first part is a straightforward consequence of the above lemma. For the second part, notice that, for every $Z' \in \mathcal{M}'$, $\mathcal{J}(Z')$ is π^1 -vertical, hence $\mathcal{J}(Z') = \mathcal{J}([\mathcal{J}(Z'), D]) \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$, i.e., $Z' - [\mathcal{J}(Z'), D]$ is a vertical vector field. ■

Now, we prove the non-projectability of the SODE Lagrangian constraints.

Proposition 7 *If $\phi^{(1)}$ is a 1st-generation SODE Lagrangian constraint, then it cannot be expressed as a $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable function.*

(*Proof*) If $\phi^{(1)}$ is a 1st-generation SODE Lagrangian constraint, then according to Theorem 9 it can be expressed as

$$\phi^{(1)} = i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) ,$$

where $Z \in \mathcal{M}$, $Z \notin \mathfrak{X}^\perp(J^1E)$ and $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is a SODE.

First, notice that $Z \notin \mathfrak{X}^\perp(J^1E) + \ker \pi_*^1$. If V is a π^1 vertical vector field then $\exists Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ such that $\mathcal{J}(Y) = Z$ and

$$i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = i(\mathcal{J}(Y))(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}) = -i(Y)i(\mathcal{J}(D))\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - i(Y)i(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Y}))\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$$

since D and $\mathcal{Y}$ are SODEs. Therefore, if $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(J^1E) + \ker \pi_*^1$, then we obtain a Lagrangian dynamical constraint. As a corollary, $Z \notin \ker \pi_*^1$.

Moreover, Z can be chosen as an element of $\mathcal{M}'$ (i.e., $Z \in \mathcal{M}$ and $Z \in \ker \bar{\pi}_*^1$) $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable. If Z is a SODE, $\mathcal{J}(Z) = 0$ and $Z \in \mathcal{M}$. But

$$\begin{aligned} i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) &= i(Z)(i(D)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - i(D)(\eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = i(Z)i(D)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - i(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} + i(D)\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} + i(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \\ &= i(Z)i(D)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(D)i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = i(D)i(\mathcal{Y} - Z)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{Y} - Z$ is π^1 -vertical. If $Z \notin \ker \bar{\pi}_*^1$ and it is not a SODE, then the SODE Lagrangian constraint $\phi^{(1)}$ can be expressed in an equivalent way as

$$\phi^{(1)} = i(Z')(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) ,$$

where $Z' = Z - (i(Z)\eta)D$ is $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical; that is, $Z' \in \mathcal{M}'$. Finally, from Lemma 5 we know that vector fields in $\mathcal{M}'$ can be chosen as $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable (notice that $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable and $\mathcal{FL}$ -nonprojectable vector fields in $\mathcal{M}'$ give rise to the same constraints, since they differ on a vertical vector field).

Now, suppose that $\phi^{(1)}$ is $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable. Then for every $V \in \mathcal{FL}_*$, we have

$$0 = V(\phi^{(1)}) = V(i(Z')(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})) = V[i(Z')(i(D)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - i(D)(\eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})] = V(i(Z')i(D)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}),$$

since $V[i(Z')(\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} - i(D)(\eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}))] = V[(i(Z')(\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}))] = 0$ (Z' is $\bar{\pi}^1$ vertical).

Therefore,

$$0 = V(\phi^{(1)}) = V(i(Z')i(D)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}) = -V(i(D)i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}) = -i([V, D])i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - i(D)L(V)(i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$$

but since Z' has been chosen to be $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable and $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is also $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable, then $L(V)(i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$. Therefore,

$$0 = V(\phi^{(1)}) = -i([V, D])i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Again using Lemma 7, we know that for every X' in $\mathcal{M}'$, $X' = [V, D] + W$, for some $V \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ and $W \in \ker \pi_*^1$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} i(X')i(Z')\omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= i(X')i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - i(X')i(Z')(\eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = i(X')i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \\ &= i([V, D])i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(W)i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = i([V, D])i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $i(X')\eta = i(Z')\eta = 0$ (they are $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical vector fields) and $i(W)i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = i(\mathcal{J}(Y))i(Z')\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -i(Y)i(\mathcal{J}(Z'))\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ for some $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ (because $\mathcal{J}(Z') \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_* \subset \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$). Hence we conclude that $i(X')i(Z')\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, for every $X' \in \mathcal{M}'$, and therefore, from Lemma 4, there exists a $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical vector field V such that $Z' - V \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$. That is, $Z' \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \ker \pi_*^1$. But, for $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical vector fields, $\ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathfrak{X}^\perp(J^1E)$, so $Z' \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(J^1E) + \ker \pi_*^1$, which contradicts the hypothesis. ■

5.3 Stability condition: new generations of constraints

In general, none of the fields of the family (39) of solutions on S_1 is tangent to this submanifold. So we must search for the points of S_1 where a vector field $V^{(0)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ exists such that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + V^{(0)}$ is tangent to S_1 . Then we define:

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \{\bar{x} \in S_1 \mid \exists V^{(0)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*, (X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + V^{(0)})_{\bar{x}} \in T_{\bar{x}}S_1\} \\ &= \{\bar{x} \in S_1 \mid \exists V^{(0)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_* \text{ such that} \\ &\quad [L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + V^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)}](\bar{x}) = 0, \forall \zeta^{(1)}, \text{ and } [L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + V^{(0)})\phi^{(1)}](\bar{x}) = 0, \forall \phi^{(1)}\} \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that the 1st-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta^{(1)} &:= i(Z^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) \quad , \quad \forall Z^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(J^1E) \quad , \quad \text{and} \\ \phi^{(1)} &:= i(Z)i(Y)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} \quad , \quad \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}, Z \notin \mathfrak{X}^\perp(J^1E), Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E), X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y \text{ SODE} . \end{aligned}$$

But, as the Lagrangian dynamical constraints can be expressed as $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable functions (Theorem 5), and $V^{(0)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$, using this in the stability condition for these constraints we have that $L(V)\zeta^{(1)} = 0$, and hence this condition reduces to

$$[L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)}](\bar{x}) = 0 \quad , \quad \text{for every } \zeta^{(1)} .$$

Then we have two options:

1. $[\mathbf{L}(\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)}](\bar{x}) = 0$, but $[\mathbf{L}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)}](\bar{x}) \neq 0$, for every $\bar{x} \in S_1$, and for some $\zeta^{(1)}$. Then we obtain new constraints of the form

$$\zeta^{(2)} := \mathbf{L}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)} \in C^\infty(J^1E) .$$

2. $[\mathbf{L}(\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)}](\bar{x}) \neq 0$, for every $\bar{x} \in S_1$, and for some $\zeta^{(1)}$. Then we obtain new constraints of the form

$$\phi^{(2)} := \mathbf{L}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)} \in C^\infty(J^1E) .$$

All these constraints are called the *2nd-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints*, and define the so-called *submanifold of 2nd-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints* $S_2 \hookrightarrow S_1$. Recall that we are assuming the hypothesis of Assumption 3. Then we have:

Proposition 8 1. *The following subsets of S_1 are the same:*

- (a) $\mathcal{A} := \{\bar{x} \in S_1 \mid [\mathbf{L}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)}](\bar{x}) = 0, \forall \zeta^{(1)} \mid [\mathbf{L}(\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\zeta^{(1)}](\bar{x}) = 0\}$.
- (b) $\mathcal{B} := \{\bar{x} \in S_1 \mid [i(\mathcal{Z}^{(1)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}})](\bar{x}) = 0, \forall \mathcal{Z}^{(1)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(S_1)\}$.
- (c) $\mathcal{C}$: *the submanifold of S_1 of zeros of 2nd-generation $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable Lagrangian constraints.*

(This means that the functions $\{\zeta^{(2)}\}$ defining this submanifold are the 2nd-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints).

2. *The functions $\phi^{(2)}$ cannot be expressed as $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable functions, and they are called 2nd-generation SODE Lagrangian constraints.*

(Proof)

1. $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$:

In order to prove this we need the following:

Lemma 8 *If $j_M: M \hookrightarrow J^1E$ is a submanifold defined by $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable constraints, and $j_S: S \hookrightarrow M$ is a submanifold defined in M by non $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable constraints, then $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(M) = \mathfrak{X}^\perp(S)$.*

(Proof) Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X}^\perp(M) &:= \{Z \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E) \mid j_M^*[i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta] = 0\} , \\ \mathfrak{X}^\perp(S) &:= \{Z \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E) \mid j_S^*j_M^*[i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta] = 0\} . \end{aligned}$$

Then it is obvious that $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(M) \subset \mathfrak{X}^\perp(S)$.

Conversely, if $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(S)$, then by definition $j_M^*[i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta] \in \Omega^1(M)$ is a constraint 1-form for S , which is non $\mathcal{FL}_M$ -projectable. Therefore, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M, S)$ being tangent to S we have

$$j_S^* i(X)[j_M^*[i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta]] = 0 .$$

Now take a local basis of $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(M)$ consisting of vector fields $\{X_i, Y_j\}$, where $\{X_i\}$ are tangent to S , but $\{Y_j\}$ are not. As M is defined in J^1E by $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable constraints, then all the vector fields tangent to the fibres of $\mathcal{FL}$ are tangent to M too. On the other hand, as S is

defined in M by non $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable constraints, these constraints remove degrees of freedom in the fibres of $\mathcal{FL}$, and hence $\{Y_j\}$ are vector fields tangent to those fibres transverse to S . As a consequence

$$j_S^* i(Y_j)[j_M^*(i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta)] = j_S^* j_M^* i(j_{M*}Y_j)[i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta] = 0$$

since $i(j_{M*}Y_j)i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$, because $j_{M*}Y_j \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_* \subset \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, and $i(j_{M*}Y_j)\eta = 0$, as η is a $\bar{\pi}^1$ -semibasic form and $j_{M*}Y_j$ are $\bar{\pi}^1$ -vertical vector fields. So, we have obtained that, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$

$$j_S^* i(X)[j_M^*(i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta)] = 0,$$

therefore $j_M^*[i(Z)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - (i(Z)\eta)\eta] = 0$, and thus $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(M)$. Hence $\mathfrak{X}^\perp(S) \subset \mathfrak{X}^\perp(M)$. $\blacksquare$

Taking this into account, we have that $\mathcal{B}$ is just the submanifold of 2nd-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints (see item 2.a of Theorem 4), and then the result follows from item 4 of Theorem 5.

$\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{A}$:

As a consequence of Theorem 6, we can take a particular $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable solution $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$. Then, as $\zeta^{(1)}$ are 1st-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints, they can also be expressed as $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable functions, and hence the result follows.

$\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$:

As a consequence of item 2.b of Theorem 4, and bearing in mind that $\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} \in \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta$, we have that every constraint defining $\mathcal{B}$ is also a constraint for $\mathcal{A}$, and then $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$.

2. It is immediate from the above item. $\blacksquare$

Remark 6 Observe that the expression of the constraints $\zeta^{(2)}$ depends only on a particular solution $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}$ of the Lagrangian equation, but the expression of $\phi^{(2)}$ involves the vector field $\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}$, which arises from the SODE condition. This fact justifies the above terminology.

Furthermore, the stability condition for the 1st-generation SODE constraints gives (on S_1)

$$0 = [L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + V^{(0)})\phi^{(1)}](\bar{x}) = [L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})\phi^{(1)} + L(V^{(0)})\phi^{(1)}](\bar{x}) \quad (40)$$

which is a system of linear equations for $V^{(0)}$, and we have:

Lemma 9 *The system (40) is compatible at all the points of S_1 .*

(*Proof*) Locally we can take a finite set of independent 1st-generation SODE constraints, $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_h$. As we have said, these constraints remove h degrees of freedom on the fibres of $\mathcal{FL}$. Then the matrix of this linear system for $V^{(0)}$ has maximal rank h , and hence the system is locally compatible. However, for every collection of local solutions, a global solution can be constructed on S_1 using a partition of unity on this manifold. Hence the system is compatible at all the points of S_1 . $\blacksquare$

Thus from this system we can determine (total or partially) the vector field $V^{(0)}$. The stability of SODE constraints does not give new constraints but removes degrees of freedom in the vector fields solution. The solutions can be written in the form

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} := X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{V}^{(1)} + V^{(1)}$$

where $\tilde{V}^{(1)}$ is a solution of (40), and $V^{(1)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ is any solution of the system $L(V^{(0)})(\phi^{(1)}) = 0$ (on S_1), and this contains all the gauge freedom. The solution $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE and is tangent to S_1 at the points of S_2 , but in general, it is not tangent to S_2 .

This discussion has been carried out for the submanifold S_1 , but it can be extended recursively until no new constraints appear. In every step, we have a submanifold S_i ($i > 1$), the so-called *submanifold of i th-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints*, which is defined by constraints of two kinds:

- $\{\zeta^{(i)}\}$, which are the *i th-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints*, and can be expressed as the (only) $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable constraints.
- $\{\phi^{(i)}\}$, which are the *i th-generation SODE Lagrangian constraints*, and are not $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable functions.

Now, we must take the corresponding vector field solutions (on S_i)

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{V}^{(i-1)} + V^{(i-1)}$$

where $\tilde{V}^{(i-1)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ is a fixed vector field, and $V^{(i-1)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ is undetermined. Therefore, the tangency condition for these *i th-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints* leads to similar results as those obtained for S_1 .

In this way, we obtain a sequence of constrained submanifolds

$$\dots \xrightarrow{i_{i+1}^i} S_i \xrightarrow{i_i^{i-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{i_2^1} S_1 \xrightarrow{i_1^0} M_1 \xrightarrow{j_1} J^1 E \quad (41)$$

and this procedure will be called the *Euler-Lagrange constraint algorithm*. As will be seen in the next subsection, if the final dynamical constraint submanifold P_f exists, this algorithm ends by giving a submanifold $S_f \hookrightarrow P_f$ which is called the *final Euler-Lagrange constraint submanifold*. In such a case, there exists a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E, S_f)$ tangent to S_f such that

$$[i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}]|_{S_f} = 0, \quad [i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\eta]|_{S_f} = 1, \quad [\mathcal{J}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})]|_{S_f} = 0.$$

As a summary of all the results given in this section, we have proved the following:

Theorem 10 *Let $(J^1 E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ be an almost regular Lagrangian system. Consider the sequence of submanifolds (41) and assume that, for every $i \geq 1$, the distributions $T^{\perp} S_i$ and $T_{S_{i+1}}^{\perp} S_i \cap TS_{i+1}$ have constant rank.*

1. *The submanifold S_1 , where there exist Euler-Lagrange vector fields (solutions of the dynamical Lagrangian equations satisfying the SODE condition) can be defined (on $J^1 E$) as the zero set of the 1st-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints, which are characterized as*

$$i(Z)(i(D)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}), \text{ for every } Z \in \mathcal{M}, \text{ and } D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1 E) \text{ a SODE}.$$

These constraints are of two kinds:

- (a) *The 1st-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints $\{\zeta^{(1)}\} \subset C^{\infty}(J^1 E)$, which are characterized as*

$$\zeta^{(1)} = i(Z^{(0)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}), \text{ for every } Z^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(J^1 E).$$

All of them can be expressed as $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable functions.

- (b) The 1st-generation SODE Lagrangian constraints $\{\phi^{(1)}\} \subset C^\infty(J^1E)$, which are characterized as

$$\phi^{(1)} := i(Z) i(Y) \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \in C^\infty(J^1E) , \text{ for every } Z \in \mathcal{M}$$

or equivalently as

$$\phi^{(1)} = i(Z) i(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} - D) \omega_{\mathcal{L}} , \text{ for every } Z \in \mathcal{M}$$

where $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$, such that $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y$ is a SODE, and $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is a SODE.

None of them can be expressed as a $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable function.

2. For every $i \geq 1$, the Euler-Lagrange vector fields solution on the submanifold S_i can be written as

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} := X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{V}^{(i-1)} + V^{(i-1)}$$

where $X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}$ is a particular solution of the dynamical Lagrangian equations, $\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \ker \eta$ is a fixed vector field such that $\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)})|_{S_i} = 0$, $\tilde{V}^{(i)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ is also a fixed vector field (with $\tilde{V}^{(0)} = 0$), and $V^{(i)} \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_*$ denotes the undetermined part of the solution.

3. Every submanifold S_{i+1} ($i \geq 1$) in this sequence can be defined (in S_i) as the zero set of the $(i+1)$ th-generation Euler-Lagrange constraints, which are of two kinds:

- (a) The $(i+1)$ th-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints, $\{\zeta^{(i+1)}\} \subset C^\infty(J^1E)$, which are obtained by making

$$\zeta^{(i+1)} := L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}) \zeta^{(i)}$$

for every $\zeta^{(i)}$ such that $[L(\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}) \zeta^{(i)}]|_{S_i} = 0$.

All of them can be expressed as $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable functions.

- (b) The $(i+1)$ th-generation SODE Lagrangian constraints, $\{\phi^{(i+1)}\} \subset C^\infty(J^1E)$, which are obtained by making

$$\phi^{(i+1)} := L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + Y_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}) \zeta^{(i)}$$

for every $\zeta^{(i)}$ such that $[L(\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}) \zeta^{(i-1)}]|_{S_i} = 0$.

None of them can be expressed as a $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable function.

4. For every i th-generation SODE Lagrangian constraint $\phi^{(i)}$ ($i \geq 1$), the stability condition

$$L(X_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)} + \tilde{V}^{(i-1)} + V^{(i-1)}) \phi^{(i)}|_{S_i} = 0$$

determines (partially or totally) the undetermined vector field $V^{(i-1)}$ (on S_i).

As an evident consequence of this, we have:

Corollary 4 For every i ($1 \leq i \leq f$), S_i is a submanifold of M_i , and $\mathcal{FL}(S_i) = \mathcal{FL}(M_i) = P_i$.

Remark 7 For autonomous almost regular mechanical systems, there is another relation between the Euler-Lagrange constraints and the Hamiltonian constraints, which is established using the so-called *time-evolution operator* [3], [8], [22], [23]. The generalization of this relation to the present case is in progress.

5.4 Properties of Euler-Lagrange vector fields

Summarizing, in Sections 4.5 and 5.3 we have given two different procedures for obtaining submanifolds of $M_f \hookrightarrow J^1E$ where Euler-Lagrange vector fields exist (satisfying the tangency condition). Concerning these procedures, the following must be pointed out:

- The submanifold S in Section 4.5 is constructed from a previously chosen ($\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable) vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^f \in \mathfrak{X}(M_f)$. Hence, in general, there is not only one, but a family of submanifolds $\{S\}$ which are diffeomorphic to $P_f \hookrightarrow J^1E$ (and $\mathcal{FL}(S) = P_f$). Moreover, for every submanifold S of the family, there exists a unique Euler-Lagrange vector field on S (tangent to S) which, in addition, is $\mathcal{FL}_f$ -projectable on the points of S .
- The SODE constraints defining the submanifold S_f as a submanifold of M_f are not $\mathcal{FL}$ -projectable, and hence they remove degrees of freedom on the fibers of the submersion $\mathcal{FL}_f$. As a consequence we have that $\mathcal{FL}(S_f) = \mathcal{FL}(M_f) = P_f$. Therefore, the submanifolds of the family $\{S\}$ are embedded submanifolds of S_f . Furthermore, the Euler-Lagrange vector fields on S_f are not unique.

Of course, in the particular case where S_f is diffeomorphic to P_f , then the family $\{S\}$ is made up of a unique submanifold which is just $S = S_f$, and the corresponding Euler-Lagrange vector field is unique and $\mathcal{FL}_f$ -projectable on the points of S_f .

- Observe also that if $\dim S_f > \dim S$, then the Euler-Lagrange vector field solution on S_f is no longer $\mathcal{FL}_f$ -projectable on the points of S_f .

In fact, let $\bar{x}_1 \equiv (t_1, q_1, v_1)$, and $\bar{x}_2 \equiv (t_2, q_2, v_2)$ be two different points in S_f , but in the same fibre of $\mathcal{FL}_f$. Then, $t_1 = t_2$, and $q_1 = q_2$, but $v_1 \neq v_2$. Now if $D \in \mathfrak{X}(J^1E)$ is an Euler-Lagrange vector field on S_f we have that

$$D_{\bar{x}_1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\bar{x}_1} + v_1^\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial q^\rho} \Big|_{\bar{x}_1} + f_1^\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\rho} \Big|_{\bar{x}_1}, \quad D_{\bar{x}_2} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\bar{x}_2} + v_2^\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial q^\rho} \Big|_{\bar{x}_2} + f_2^\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\rho} \Big|_{\bar{x}_2}$$

and $\mathcal{FL}(\bar{x}_1) = \mathcal{FL}(\bar{x}_2)$, but $\mathcal{FL}_*(D_{\bar{x}_1}) \neq \mathcal{FL}_*(D_{\bar{x}_2})$, and the result follows.

6 Dirac brackets and time-dependent constrained Hamiltonian systems

In this Section, we introduce the Dirac bracket as a local Poisson bracket on the restricted momentum dual bundle $J^{1*}E$ associated with an almost regular Lagrangian system. Then we prove that if g is an observable (that is, g is a $C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$ -differentiable real function on P_f), the time evolution of g consists essentially of two terms: the restriction to P_f of the Dirac bracket of G and a suitable Hamiltonian and the restriction to P_f of the derivative of G with respect to a fixed vector field. Here G is an arbitrary extension of g to $J^{1*}E$.

In order to introduce the Dirac bracket, we use a suitable cosymplectic structure on $J^{1*}E$ and consider a special basis of constraints for the submanifold P_f . In fact, we classify the constraints into first and second class and show that the second class constraints are Casimir functions for the Dirac bracket.

6.1 Cosymplectic structures on the restricted momentum dual bundle associated with an almost regular Lagrangian system

Assume that $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is an almost regular Lagrangian system.

We will use the notation of Sections 4.1 and 4.2. The following commutative diagram illustrates the situation

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \tilde{\mathcal{P}} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{j}_0} & T^*E & & \\
 & \nearrow \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0 & \uparrow h_0 & & \downarrow \mu & \searrow \bar{\sigma}^1 & \\
 J^1E & & \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{j_0} & J^{1*}E & \xrightarrow{\sigma^1} & E \xrightarrow{\pi} B \\
 & \searrow \mathcal{FL}_0 & \downarrow \mu_0 & & \downarrow \tau^1 & \nearrow \bar{\tau}^1 & \\
 & & E & \xrightarrow{\pi} & B & &
 \end{array}$$

π^1 (vertical arrow from J^1E to E)
 τ_0^1 (vertical arrow from $\mathcal{P}$ to E)
 $\bar{\tau}_0^1$ (diagonal arrow from $\mathcal{P}$ to B)

Now, let ∇ be a connection in $\pi : E \rightarrow B$ or, equivalently, a vector field $\mathcal{Y}_E$ on E such that $\pi^*(\varpi)(\mathcal{Y}_E) = 1$.

For every point $x \in E$, we have a splitting of the tangent space T_xE

$$T_xE = H_x(\nabla) \oplus V_x(\pi),$$

where $V(\pi)$ is the π -vertical subbundle and $H(\nabla)$ is the horizontal subbundle associated with ∇ . Denote by $Hor_x^\nabla : T_xE \rightarrow H_x(\nabla)$ and by $Ver_x^\nabla : T_xE \rightarrow V_x(\pi)$ the horizontal and vertical projectors. Then,

$$Hor_x^\nabla(X) = (\pi^*(\varpi)_x(X))\mathcal{Y}_E(x), \quad Ver_x^\nabla(X) = X - Hor_x^\nabla(X). \quad (42)$$

Thus, if ${}^t(Ver^\nabla) : T^*E \rightarrow T^*E$ is the adjoint homomorphism of the homomorphism of vector bundles $Ver^\nabla : TE \rightarrow V(\pi) \subseteq TE$, then it follows that

$${}^t(Ver^\nabla)_x(\alpha) = \alpha - (i\mathcal{Y}_E)(\alpha)\pi^*(\varpi)_x, \quad (43)$$

for $x \in E$ and $\alpha \in T_x^*E$, where $i\mathcal{Y}_E : T^*E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the function defined by

$$(i\mathcal{Y}_E)(\beta) = \beta(\mathcal{Y}_E(x)), \quad \text{for } \beta \in T_x^*E. \quad (44)$$

From (43), (44) and the definition of the Liouville 1-form Θ of T^*E , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
 {}^t(Ver^\nabla)^*(\Theta) &= \Theta - (i\mathcal{Y}_E)(\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi) \\
 {}^t(Ver^\nabla)^*(\Omega) &= \Omega + d(i\mathcal{Y}_E) \wedge (\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi).
 \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Using (43) it is also easy to prove that ${}^t(Ver^\nabla)$ induces a smooth map ${}^t(\widetilde{Ver^\nabla}) : J^{1*}E = \frac{T^*E}{\Lambda_0 T^*E} \rightarrow T^*E$ in such a way that

$${}^t(\widetilde{Ver^\nabla}) \circ \mu = {}^t(Ver^\nabla), \quad \mu \circ {}^t(\widetilde{Ver^\nabla}) = Id. \quad (46)$$

As a consequence, $\widetilde{t(Ver^\nabla)}$ is a global section of the submersion $\mu : TE \rightarrow J^{1*}E$ and, in particular, $S_E^\nabla = \widetilde{t(Ver^\nabla)}(J^{1*}E)$ is an embedded submanifold of T^*E of codimension 1. Moreover, the map $\widetilde{t(Ver^\nabla)} : J^{1*}E \rightarrow S_E^\nabla$ is a diffeomorphism. Note that

$$S_E^\nabla = \{\alpha \in T^*E / (i_{\mathcal{Y}_E})(\alpha) = 0\}. \quad (47)$$

Now, we introduce the 1-form $\tilde{\Theta}^\nabla$ and the 2-form $\tilde{\omega}^\nabla$ on $J^{1*}E$ given by

$$\tilde{\Theta}^\nabla = \widetilde{t(Ver^\nabla)^*}(\Theta), \quad \tilde{\omega}^\nabla = \widetilde{t(Ver^\nabla)^*}(\Omega) = -d\tilde{\Theta}^\nabla. \quad (48)$$

The 1-form $\tilde{\Theta}^\nabla$ (resp. the 2-form $\tilde{\omega}^\nabla$) is called the *Liouville 1-form* (resp. *2-form*) of $J^{1*}E$ associated with the connection ∇ .

Denote by $\tilde{\eta}$ the 1-form on $J^{1*}E$ given by $\tilde{\eta} = (\bar{\tau}^1)^*(\varpi)$ (see Section 4.1).

Theorem 11 1. The couple $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ is a cosymplectic structure on $J^{1*}E$.

2. If $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla$ is the Reeb vector field of $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ we have that

$$\widetilde{t(Ver^\nabla)_*}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla) = X_{i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}}|_{S_E^\nabla},$$

where $X_{i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}}$ is the Hamiltonian vector field on the symplectic manifold (T^*E, Ω) associated with the function $i_{\mathcal{Y}_E} : T^*E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

(Proof) If $i_E^\nabla : S_E^\nabla \rightarrow T^*E$ is the canonical inclusion, then since $\widetilde{t(Ver^\nabla)^*}((\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi)) = \tilde{\eta}$, we must prove that the couple $((i_E^\nabla)^*(\Omega), (i_E^\nabla)^*((\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi)))$ is a cosymplectic structure on S_E^∇ with Reeb vector field $X_{i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}}|_{S_E^\nabla}$.

It is clear that $(i_E^\nabla)^*(\Omega)$ (respectively, $(i_E^\nabla)^*((\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi))$) is a closed 2-form (respectively, 1-form) on S_E^∇ and that the restriction of $X_{i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}}$ to S_E^∇ is tangent to S_E^∇ (see (47)). Moreover, from (44) and since $\pi^*(\varpi)(\mathcal{Y}_E) = 1$, it follows that $((\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi))(X_{i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}}) = 1$, which implies that $((i_E^\nabla)^*((\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi)))(X_{i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}}|_{S_E^\nabla}) = 1$.

Furthermore, using (47), we obtain that $\ker((i_E^\nabla)^*(\Omega)) = \langle X_{i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}}|_{S_E^\nabla} \rangle$.

This ends the proof of the result. ■

Remark 8 From (45), (46) and (48), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(\tilde{\Theta}^\nabla) &= \Theta - (i_{\mathcal{Y}_E})((\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi)), \\ \mu^*(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla) &= \Omega + d(i_{\mathcal{Y}_E}) \wedge (\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Next we study the relation between the cosymplectic structure $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ and the cosymplectic structure on $J^{1*}E$ defined by another connection ∇' on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{Y}'_E$ is the vector field on E associated with ∇' . Then, $\pi^*(\varpi)(\mathcal{Y}'_E) = 1$ and

$$V = \mathcal{Y}'_E - \mathcal{Y}_E$$

is a vertical vector field with respect to $\pi : E \rightarrow B$. This implies that the function $iV : T^*E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$(iV)(\alpha) = \alpha(V(x)), \quad \text{for } \alpha \in T_x^*E$$

induces a smooth function $i\widetilde{V} : J^{1*}E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in such a way that

$$\mu^*(i\widetilde{V}) = iV. \quad (50)$$

Moreover, we obtain that

Theorem 12 (i) *If $(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla'}, \tilde{\eta})$ is the cosymplectic structure on $J^{1*}E$ defined by the connection ∇' then*

$$\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla'} = \tilde{\omega}^{\nabla} + d(i\widetilde{V}) \wedge \tilde{\eta}.$$

(ii) *If $f : J^{1*}E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real C^∞ -function and X_f^{∇} (respectively, $X_f^{\nabla'}$) is the Hamiltonian vector field of f with respect to the cosymplectic structure $(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla}, \tilde{\eta})$ (respectively, $(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla'}, \tilde{\eta})$) then $X_f^{\nabla} = X_f^{\nabla'}$.*

(iii) *If $\{ , \}^{\nabla}$ (respectively, $\{ , \}^{\nabla'}$) is the Poisson bracket associated with the cosymplectic structure $(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla}, \tilde{\eta})$ (respectively, $(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla'}, \tilde{\eta})$) then*

$$\{ , \}^{\nabla'} = \{ , \}^{\nabla}.$$

(Proof) Using (49) and (50), it follows that

$$\mu^*(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla'}) = \mu^*(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla}) + d(iV) \wedge \tilde{\eta} = \mu^*(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla} + d(i\widetilde{V})) \wedge \tilde{\eta}.$$

Therefore, since μ^* is injective, we conclude that

$$\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla'} = \tilde{\omega}^{\nabla} + d(i\widetilde{V}) \wedge \tilde{\eta}.$$

This proves (i).

(ii) and (iii) follow from (i) and Proposition 10 (see Appendix C). ■

Let us now recall the definition of the *Hamiltonian density* and of the *Hamiltonian function* associated with the Lagrangian system, the 1-form ϖ and a connection ∇ on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$ (see [6, 13, 16]).

Using the connection ∇ , we can introduce the *Hamilton-Cartan 1-form* $\Theta_{h_0}^{\nabla}$ on $\mathcal{P}$ associated with the Lagrangian system, the 1-form ϖ and the connection ∇ . This 1-form is given by

$$(\Theta_{h_0}^{\nabla})_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{X}) = h_0(\tilde{x})(Ver_x^{\nabla}((\tau_0^1)_{*\tilde{x}}(\tilde{X}))), \quad (51)$$

for $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\tilde{X} \in T_{\tilde{x}}\mathcal{P}$. The 1-form $\Theta_{h_0}^{\nabla}$ allows us to introduce, in a natural way, the *Hamilton-Cartan 2-form* $\Omega_{h_0}^{\nabla}$ on $\mathcal{P}$ which is defined by $\Omega_{h_0}^{\nabla} = -d\Theta_{h_0}^{\nabla}$.

If $\tilde{X}$ is vertical with respect to the projection $\tau_0^1 : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow B$, a direct computation, using (42), (51) and the fact that $\Theta_{h_0} = (\tilde{j}_0 \circ h_0)^*(\Theta)$, shows that

$$(\Theta_{h_0}^{\nabla} - \Theta_{h_0})_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{X}) = 0.$$

Therefore, there exists $h_0^{\nabla} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$ such that

$$\Theta_{h_0}^{\nabla} - \Theta_{h_0} = h_0^{\nabla}((\bar{\tau}_0^1)^*(\varpi)) = h_0^{\nabla}(\eta^0). \quad (52)$$

$\mathfrak{h}_0^{\nabla} = h_0^{\nabla}(\eta^0)$ and h_0^{∇} are called the *Hamiltonian density* and the *Hamiltonian function* associated with the Lagrangian system, the connection ∇ and the 1-form ϖ (see [6, 13, 16]).

Remark 9 If $\mathcal{Y}'_E$ is the vector field on E associated with another connection ∇' on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$ and $V = \mathcal{Y}'_E - \mathcal{Y}_E$ is the corresponding vertical vector field with respect to $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, then using (51) and (52), and the fact that $\Theta_{h_0} = (\tilde{j}_0 \circ h_0)^*(\Theta)$, we deduce that

$$h_0^{\nabla'} = h_0^\nabla - i\widetilde{V}|_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad (53)$$

where $i\widetilde{V} : J^{1*}E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the real function on $J^{1*}E$ induced by the vector field V . This implies that

$$\Theta_{h_0}^{\nabla'} = \Theta_{h_0}^\nabla - (i\widetilde{V})|_P \eta^0, \quad \Omega_{h_0}^{\nabla'} = \Omega_{h_0}^\nabla + d(i\widetilde{V})|_P \wedge \eta^0.$$

Next, we will introduce an extension $\tilde{h}^\nabla : J^{1*}E \rightarrow T^*E$ of the diffeomorphism $h_0 : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. For this purpose, we consider an arbitrary extension $h^\nabla : J^{1*}E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the Hamiltonian function $h_0^\nabla : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then, we define the map $H^\nabla : T^*E \rightarrow T^*E$ given by

$$H^\nabla(\alpha) = \alpha - (h^\nabla(\mu(\alpha)) + (i\mathcal{Y}_E)(\alpha))\pi^*(\varpi)(\sigma^1(\alpha)). \quad (54)$$

It is clear that $\sigma^1 \circ H^\nabla = \sigma^1$. Furthermore, we have

Lemma 10 *The following relations hold*

$$\mu \circ H^\nabla = \mu \quad (55)$$

$$(H^\nabla)^*(\Theta) = \Theta - (h^\nabla \circ \mu + i\mathcal{Y}_E)(\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi) \quad (56)$$

$$(H^\nabla)^*(\Omega) = \Omega + (\mu^*(dh^\nabla) + d(i\mathcal{Y}_E)) \wedge (\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi) \quad (57)$$

$$H^\nabla \circ \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}_0} = \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}_0} \quad (58)$$

(*Proof*) From (54) it follows (55).

Furthermore, using (54), the definition of Θ and the fact that $\sigma^1 \circ H^\nabla = \sigma^1$, we deduce that (56) holds. Therefore,

$$(H^\nabla)^*(\Omega) = -d((H^\nabla)^*(\Theta)) = \Omega + (\mu^*(dh^\nabla) + d(i\mathcal{Y}_E)) \wedge (\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi).$$

Finally, we will prove that (58). Let $\bar{y}$ be a point of J^1E . Assume that $\pi^1(\bar{y}) = \sigma^1(\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}_0}(\bar{y})) = x$ and that $\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_E(\bar{y})$ is a tangent vector to J^1E at $\bar{y}$ such that $(\pi^1)_{*\bar{y}}(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_E(\bar{y})) = \mathcal{Y}_E(x)$.

From (23), (28), (51) and (52), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} h^\nabla(\mu(\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}_0}(\bar{y}))) + \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}_0}(\bar{y})(\mathcal{Y}_E(x)) &= h_0^\nabla(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y})) + \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{y})(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_E(\bar{y})) \\ &= h_0^\nabla(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y})) + \Theta_{h_0}(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}))((\mathcal{FL}_0)_{*\bar{y}}(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_E(\bar{y}))) \\ &= \Theta_{h_0}^\nabla(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}))((\mathcal{FL}_0)_{*\bar{y}}(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_E(\bar{y}))) \\ &= h_0(\mathcal{FL}_0(\bar{y}))(Ver_x^\nabla(\mathcal{Y}_E(x))) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

As a consequence, using (54) and (59), we conclude that $H^\nabla(\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}_0}(\bar{y})) = \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}_0}(\bar{y})$. ■

Suppose that $\mu(\alpha) = \mu(\alpha')$, for $\alpha, \alpha' \in T^*E$. Then, $H^\nabla(\alpha) = H^\nabla(\alpha')$ (see (54)). Thus, there exists a mapping $\tilde{h}^\nabla : J^{1*}E \rightarrow T^*E$ such that

$$\tilde{h}^\nabla \circ \mu = H^\nabla. \quad (60)$$

Moreover, from (55), we have that $(\mu \circ \tilde{h}^\nabla) \circ \mu = \mu$, which implies that

$$\mu \circ \tilde{h}^\nabla = Id. \quad (61)$$

Since μ is submersion, we deduce that $\tilde{h}^\nabla$ is a smooth mapping, and therefore $\tilde{h}^\nabla$ is a global section of $\mu : T^*E \rightarrow J^{1*}E$.

Furthermore, using (55), (58) and the fact that $\mu(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}) = \mathcal{P}$, it follows that $\tilde{h}^\nabla(\mathcal{P}) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. Furthermore, using (58), (60) and (61), we obtain that

$$\mu_0 \circ \tilde{h}^\nabla|_{\mathcal{P}} = Id, \quad \tilde{h}^\nabla|_{\mathcal{P}} \circ \mu_0 = Id,$$

that is, $\tilde{h}^\nabla|_{\mathcal{P}} = \mu_0^{-1} = h_0$. We now introduce the 1-form Θ_{h^∇} and the 2-form Ω_{h^∇} on $J^{1*}E$ given by

$$\Theta_{h^\nabla} = (\tilde{h}^\nabla)^*(\Theta), \quad \Omega_{h^\nabla} = (\tilde{h}^\nabla)^*(\Omega) = -d\Theta_{h^\nabla}.$$

It is clear that

$$j_0^*(\Theta_{h^\nabla}) = \Theta_{h_0}, \quad j_0^*(\Omega_{h^\nabla}) = \Omega_{h_0}. \quad (62)$$

From (57) and (60), we deduce that

$$\mu^*(\Omega_{h^\nabla}) = \Omega + (\mu^*(dh^\nabla) + d(i\mathcal{Y}_E)) \wedge (\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi)$$

and using (49), it follows that

$$\mu^*(\Omega_{h^\nabla}) = \mu^*(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla) + \mu^*(dh^\nabla) \wedge (\bar{\sigma}^1)^*(\varpi) = \mu^*(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla + dh^\nabla \wedge \tilde{\eta}).$$

Since μ^* is injective, this implies that

$$\Omega_{h^\nabla} = \tilde{\omega}^\nabla + dh^\nabla \wedge \tilde{\eta}. \quad (63)$$

Thus (see Proposition 10 in Appendix C), we have the following

Theorem 13 1. The couple $(\Omega_{h^\nabla}, \tilde{\eta})$ is a cosymplectic structure on $J^{1*}E$ with Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_{h^\nabla}$ given by

$$\mathcal{R}_{h^\nabla} = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla + X_{h^\nabla}^\nabla = E_{h^\nabla}^\nabla,$$

where $X_{h^\nabla}^\nabla$ (respectively, $E_{h^\nabla}^\nabla$) is the Hamiltonian vector field (respectively, the evolution vector field) of h^∇ with regard to the cosymplectic structure $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$.

2. If $f : J^{1*}E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real C^∞ -differentiable function and $X_f^{h^\nabla}$ (respectively, X_f^∇) is the Hamiltonian vector field of f with regard to the cosymplectic structure $(\Omega_{h^\nabla}, \tilde{\eta})$ (respectively, $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$) then $X_f^{h^\nabla} = X_f^\nabla$.
3. If $\{ , \}^\nabla$ (respectively, $\{ , \}^{h^\nabla}$) is the Poisson bracket associated with the cosymplectic structure $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ (respectively, $(\Omega_{h^\nabla}, \tilde{\eta})$), then

$$\{ , \}^\nabla = \{ , \}^{h^\nabla}.$$

Remark 10 If $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a hyperregular Lagrangian system then $\mathcal{P} = J^{1*}E$, $j_0 = Id$ and $\Omega_{h_0} = \Omega_{h^\nabla}$. Thus, (Ω_{h_0}, η^0) is a cosymplectic structure on $J^{1*}E$ and $\mathcal{R}_{h^\nabla} = E_{h^\nabla}^\nabla$ is the unique solution of the Hamilton equations

$$i(\mathcal{R}_{h^\nabla})\Omega_{h_0} = 0, \quad i(\mathcal{R}_{h^\nabla})\eta^0 = 1.$$

Next we will write the local expressions of some of the geometric structures introduced above. Assume that (t, q^j, p_j) and (t, q^j, p, p_j) are natural coordinates on $J^{1*}E$ and T^*E , respectively. If the local expression of $\mathcal{Y}_E$ is

$$\mathcal{Y}_E = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} {}^t(Ver^\nabla)(t, q^i, p, p_i) &= {}^t(\widetilde{Ver^\nabla})(t, q^i, p_i) = (t, q^i, -\mathcal{Y}_E^j(t, q^i)p_j, p_i) \\ \tilde{\Theta}^\nabla &= p_i dq^i - (\mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j)p_i) dt \\ \tilde{\omega}^\nabla &= dq^i \wedge dp_i - dt \wedge \left(\mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j) dp_i + p_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{Y}_E^i}{\partial q^j} dq^j \right) \\ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - p_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{Y}_E^i}{\partial q^j} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \\ H^\nabla(t, q^i, p, p_i) &= (t, q^i, -h^\nabla(t, q^j, p_j) - \mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j)p_i, p_i) \\ \tilde{h}^\nabla(t, q^i, p_i) &= (t, q^i, -h^\nabla(t, q^j, p_j) - \mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j)p_i, p_i) \\ \Theta_{h^\nabla} &= p_i dq^i + (h^\nabla(t, q^j, p_j) - \mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j)p_i) dt \\ \Omega_{h^\nabla} &= dq^i \wedge dp_i - dt \wedge \left(\mathcal{Y}_E^i(t, q^j) dp_i + p_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{Y}_E^i}{\partial q^j} dq^j \right) + dh^\nabla \wedge dt \\ X_{h^\nabla}^\nabla &= \frac{\partial h^\nabla}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + \frac{\partial h^\nabla}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \\ \mathcal{R}_{h^\nabla} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \left(\mathcal{Y}_E^j(t, q^i) + \frac{\partial h^\nabla}{\partial p_j} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} - \left(\frac{\partial h^\nabla}{\partial q^j} + p_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{Y}_E^i}{\partial q^j} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

6.2 First and second class constraints and the solutions of the Hamiltonian dynamics

Assume that $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is an almost regular Lagrangian system as in Section 6.1.

If ∇ is a connection on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, we will denote by $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ the cosymplectic structure on $J^{1*}E$ introduced in Section 6.1 (see Theorem 11), by $\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla$ the Poisson 2-vector associated with such a structure, and by $\{ , \}^\nabla$ the corresponding Poisson bracket (see Appendix B).

Let P_0 (resp. P_f) be the first (resp. final) Hamiltonian dynamical constraint submanifold. If p_0 (resp. p_f) is the dimension of P_0 (resp. P_f), then since the pull-back of the 1-form $\tilde{\eta}$ to P_0 (resp. P_f) is not zero at every point of P_f , it follows that the distribution $\#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_0)^0)$ (resp. $\#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f)^0)$) has constant rank $2n + 1 - p_0$ (resp. $2n + 1 - p_f$) along P_f . We will suppose that the distributions $TP_0 \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_0)^0)$, $TP_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f P_0)^0)$ and $TP_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f)^0)$ also have constant rank k_0, k_{0f} and k_f , respectively, along P_f .

Remark 11 If ∇' is another connection on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, then from Theorem 12 we deduce that $\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla = \tilde{\Lambda}^{\nabla'}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} TP_0 \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{\nabla'}}((TP_0)^0) &= TP_0 \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_0)^0) \\ TP_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{\nabla'}}((TP_f P_0)^0) &= TP_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f P_0)^0) \\ TP_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{\nabla'}}((TP_f)^0) &= TP_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f)^0). \end{aligned}$$

With the above hypotheses, we will show that it is possible to choose a suitable basis of constraints for the submanifold P_f . We will proceed in three steps.

First step: Assume that $\{\xi_i^{(0)}\}_{i=1, \dots, 2n+1-p_0}$ is a set of local independent constraint functions

defining P_0 as a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$. Then the rank of the matrix

$$(\{\xi_i^{(0)}, \xi_{i'}^{(0)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f})_{1 \leq i, i' \leq 2n+1-p_0}$$

is $l_0 = 2n + 1 - p_0 - k_0$. We can suppose, without loss of generality, that the l_0 first rows of this matrix are independent. With this hypothesis, it is easy to prove that for every $j, 1 \leq j \leq k_0$, there exist local real functions $\{f_j^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq l_0}$ on $J^{1*}E$ such that the matrix

$$(\{\xi_i^{(0)}, \xi_{i'}^{(0)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f})_{1 \leq i, i' \leq l_0}$$

is regular. In addition, $\{X_{\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}}^{\nabla}|_{P_f}\}_{1 \leq j \leq k_0}$ is a local basis of the distribution $TP_0 \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{\nabla}}((TP_0)^0)$ along P_f , where

$$\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)} = \xi_{l_0+j}^{(0)} - f_j^i \xi_i^{(0)}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq k_0.$$

Thus, if $\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)} = \xi_i^{(0)}$, for $1 \leq i \leq l_0$, it is clear that $\{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}\}_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq l_0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq k_0}}$ is a set of local independent constraint functions defining P_0 as a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$.

Second step: Assume that $\{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \xi_r^{(f)}\}_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq l_0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq k_0 \\ 1 \leq r \leq p_0 - p_f}}$ is a set of local independent constraint

functions defining P_f as a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$. Then the rank of the matrix

$$(\{\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \xi_r^{(f)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f})_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k_0 \\ 1 \leq r \leq p_0 - p_f}}$$

is $k_0 - k_{0f}$. We can suppose, without loss of generality, that the $k_0 - k_{0f}$ first rows of this matrix are independent. With this hypothesis, it is easy to prove that for every $t, 1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}$, there exist local real functions $\{g_t^j\}_{1 \leq j \leq k_0 - k_{0f}}$, such that

$$\{X_{\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}}^{\nabla}|_{P_f}\}_{1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}}$$

is a local basis of the distribution $TP_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{\nabla}}((TP_f P_0)^0)$, where

$$\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)} = \tilde{\xi}_{k_0 - k_{0f} + t}^{(0)} - g_t^j \tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}.$$

It is clear that $\{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}, \xi_r^{(f)}\}$, with $1 \leq i \leq l_0$, $1 \leq j \leq k_0 - k_{0f}$, $1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}$ and $1 \leq r \leq p_0 - p_f$, is a set of local independent constraint functions defining P_f as a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$.

Third step: We consider the $(l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + (p_0 - p_f)) \times (l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + (p_0 - p_f))$ matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_{i'}^{(0)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f} & 0 & \{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \xi_r^{(f)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f} \\ 0 & 0 & \{\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \xi_r^{(f)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f} \\ -\{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \xi_r^{(f)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f} & -\{\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \xi_r^{(f)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f} & \{\xi_r^{(f)}, \xi_{r'}^{(f)}\}^{\nabla}|_{P_f} \end{pmatrix}$$

A direct computation shows that the $l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f})$ first rows are independent and that the rank of this matrix is $l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + s_f$, with $s_f = (p_0 - p_f) - (k_f - k_{0f})$. We can suppose, without loss of generality, that the $l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + s_f$ first rows are independent. Then, it is easy to prove that for every $u, 1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}$, there exist local real functions $\{h_u^r\}_{1 \leq r \leq s_f}$ such that

$$\{X_{\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}}^{\nabla}|_{P_f}, X_{\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}}^{\nabla}|_{P_f}\}_{\substack{1 \leq t \leq k_{0f} \\ 1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}}}$$

is a local basis of the distribution $TP_f \cap \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f)^0)$, where

$$\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)} = \xi_{s_f+u}^{(f)} - h_u^r \xi_r^{(f)}.$$

In conclusion, if $\tilde{\xi}_r^{(f)} = \xi_r^{(f)}$, for $1 \leq r \leq s_f$, we have that $\{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_r^{(f)}, \tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}\}$ with $1 \leq i \leq l_0$, $1 \leq j \leq k_0 - k_{0f}$, $1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}$, $1 \leq r \leq s_f$ and $1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}$, is a set of local independent constraint functions defining P_f as a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$. Moreover, along P_f

$$\begin{aligned} TP_0 \cap \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_0)^0) &= \langle X_{\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}}^{-\nabla}|_{P_f}, X_{\tilde{\xi}_t^{(0)}}^{-\nabla}|_{P_f} \rangle_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k_0 - k_{0f} \\ 1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}}} \\ TP_f \cap \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f P_0)^0) &= \langle X_{\tilde{\xi}_t^{(0)}}^{-\nabla}|_{P_f} \rangle_{1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}} \\ TP_f \cap \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f)^0) &= \langle X_{\tilde{\xi}_t^{(0)}}^{-\nabla}|_{P_f}, X_{\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}}^{-\nabla}|_{P_f} \rangle_{\substack{1 \leq t \leq k_{0f} \\ 1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}}} \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

In addition, if we denote by

$$\{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha\}_{1 \leq \alpha \leq l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + s_f} = \{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_r^{(f)}\}_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq l_0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq k_0 - k_{0f} \\ 1 \leq r \leq s_f}} \quad (66)$$

then we deduce that the matrix

$$(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha\beta} = \{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha, \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta\}^{-\nabla}|_{P_f})_{1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + s_f}$$

is regular.

Following Dirac's terminology, $\{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha\}_{1 \leq \alpha \leq l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + s_f}$ and $\{\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}\}_{\substack{1 \leq t \leq k_{0f} \\ 1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}}}$ are said to be *second-class* and *first-class constraints* for the submanifold P_f , respectively.

We now consider the completely integrable distribution D whose annihilator D^0 is generated by

$$\{d\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha\}_{1 \leq \alpha \leq l_0 + (k_0 - k_{0f}) + s_f}.$$

Since the matrix $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha\beta})$ is regular, it follows that there exists an open neighbourhood U of P_f in $J^{1*}E$ such that $T_U J^{1*}E = D \oplus \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}(D^0)$.

Thus, we have the corresponding projectors

$$\mathbb{P} : T_U J^{1*}E \rightarrow D, \quad \mathbb{Q} : T_U J^{1*}E \rightarrow \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}(D^0).$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\mathbb{Q} = \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta} X_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha}^{-\nabla} \otimes d\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta, \quad \mathbb{P} = Id - \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta} X_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha}^{-\nabla} \otimes d\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta, \quad (67)$$

where $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta})$ is the inverse of matrix $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha\beta})$.

Remark 12 If $X \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega}^\nabla(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla), \mathbb{P}(X)) &= -\tilde{\omega}^\nabla(\mathbb{Q}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla), \mathbb{P}(X)) = -\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta)(i(X_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha}^{-\nabla})\tilde{\omega}^\nabla)(\mathbb{P}(X)) \\ &= (\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta) \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha)) \tilde{\eta}(\mathbb{P}(X)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using that $\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta} = -\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta\alpha}$, it follows that

$$\tilde{\omega}^\nabla(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla), \mathbb{P}(X)) = 0, \quad \tilde{\eta}(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)) = 1.$$

Therefore, if $\mathbb{T}P_f \cap \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}((\mathbb{T}P_f)^0) = \{0\}$ and $j_f : P_f \rightarrow J^{1*}E$ is the canonical inclusion then $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}$ is tangent to P_f and

$$i(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f})j_f^*(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla) = 0, \quad i(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f})j_f^*(\tilde{\eta}) = 1.$$

As a consequence, from Lemmas 14 and 16 (see Appendices A and B), we deduce that the couple $(j_f^*(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla), j_f^*(\tilde{\eta}))$ is a cosymplectic structure on P_f , and that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}$ is the Reeb vector field of this structure.

Remark 13 If ∇' is another connection on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, and we consider the same initial set of constraints $\{\xi_i^{(0)}\}_{i=1,\dots,2n+1-p_0}$ defining P_0 (as a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$), then following the above process we obtain the same final set of constraints $\{\tilde{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_t^{(0)}, \tilde{\xi}_r^{(f)}, \tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}\}$ defining the submanifold P_f (see Theorem 12). Therefore, we also obtain the same splitting of $\mathbb{T}_U J^{1*}E$ and the same projectors

$$\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{T}_U J^{1*}E \rightarrow D, \quad \mathbb{Q} : \mathbb{T}_U J^{1*}E \rightarrow \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^{\nabla'}}(D^0) = \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}(D^0).$$

Next, suppose that $h^\nabla : J^{1*}E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary extension of the Hamiltonian function $h_0^\nabla : P_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and that $E_{h^\nabla}^\nabla = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla + X_{h^\nabla}^\nabla$ is the evolution vector field of h^∇ with respect to the cosymplectic structure $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ (see Section 6.1).

We will prove that the restriction to P_f of $\mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}^\nabla)$ is tangent to P_f , and that such a restriction is a solution of the constrained Hamilton equations. For this purpose, we will use the following result.

Lemma 11 *If x_f is a point of P_f , then*

$$\{X \in \mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0 / i(X)(\Omega_{h_0}(x_f))|_{\mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0} = 0, i(X)(\eta^0(x_f)) = 0\} = \mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0 \cap \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}(x_f)((\mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0)^0).$$

(*Proof*) Suppose that $X_{h_0}^f$ is a solution of the constrained Hamilton equations on the submanifold P_f ; that is, $X_{h_0}^f \in \mathfrak{X}(P_f)$ and

$$(i(X_{h_0}^f)\Omega_{h_0})|_{P_f} = 0, \quad (i(X_{h_0}^f)\eta^0)|_{P_f} = 1.$$

We consider the cosymplectic structure $(\bar{\omega}^\nabla(x_f), \eta^0(x_f))$ on the vector space $\mathbb{T}_{x_f}J^{1*}E$, where

$$\bar{\omega}^\nabla(x_f) = \Omega_{h_0}(x_f) - (i(Y_{h_0}^f)\Omega_{h_0})(x_f) \wedge \eta^0(x_f).$$

The Reeb vector of this structure is $Y_{h_0}^f(x_f)$. Since $Y_{h_0}^f(x_f) \in \mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0$ and

$$\bar{\omega}^\nabla(x_f)(Y, Z) = \Omega_{h_0}(x_f)(Y, Z),$$

for $Y, Z \in \mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{X \in \mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0 / (i(X)(\Omega_{h_0}(x_f)))|_{\mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0} = 0, i(X)(\eta^0(x_f)) = 0\} \\ &= \{X \in \mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0 / i(X)(\bar{\omega}^\nabla(x_f))|_{\mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0} = 0, i(X)(\tilde{\eta}(x_f)) = 0\} \\ &= \mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0 \cap \#_{\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla}(x_f)((\mathbb{T}_{x_f}P_0)^0), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}^\nabla(x_f)$ is the 2-vector on $\mathbb{T}_{x_f}J^{1*}E$ associated with the cosymplectic structure $(\bar{\omega}^\nabla(x_f), \tilde{\eta}(x_f))$ (see Appendix B). Therefore, using Proposition 9 (see Appendix B) and the fact that

$$\bar{\omega}^\nabla(x_f) = \tilde{\omega}^\nabla(x_f) + (dh^\nabla(x_f) - (i(Y_{h_0}^f)\Omega_{h_0})(x_f)) \wedge \tilde{\eta}(x_f),$$

we deduce the result. ■

Theorem 14 *The restriction to the submanifold P_f of the vector field $\mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla})$ is tangent to P_f and, in addition, this restriction is a solution of the constrained Hamilton equations; that is,*

$$[i(\mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla}))\Omega_{h_0}]|_{P_f} = 0, \quad [i(\mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla}))\eta^0]|_{P_f} = 1. \quad (68)$$

(Proof) The definition of the distribution D implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla})(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha) = 0, \quad \text{for every } \alpha. \quad (69)$$

Furthermore, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla}) = E_h^{\nabla} - \lambda^i X_{\xi_i^{(0)}}^{\nabla} - \mu^j X_{\xi_j^{(0)}}^{\nabla} - \nu^r X_{\xi_r^{(f)}}^{\nabla}. \quad (70)$$

As a consequence, from (65) and (70), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla})|_{P_f}(\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}) &= E_h^{\nabla}|_{P_f}(\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}), \quad 1 \leq t \leq k_{0f} \\ \mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla})|_{P_f}(\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}) &= E_h^{\nabla}|_{P_f}(\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}), \quad 1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Now, let $X_{h_0}^f$ be a solution of the constrained Hamilton equations on the submanifold P_f .

Using (62), (63) and the fact that

$$\Omega_{h_0}(X_{h_0}^f, X_{\xi_j^{(0)}}^{\nabla})|_{P_f} = \Omega_{h_0}(X_{h_0}^f, X_{\xi_t^{(0)}}^{\nabla})|_{P_f} = \Omega_{h_0}(X_{h_0}^f, X_{\xi_u^{(f)}}^{\nabla})|_{P_f} = 0$$

we deduce that

$$E_h^{\nabla}|_{P_f}(\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)}) = E_h^{\nabla}|_{P_f}(\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}) = E_h^{\nabla}|_{P_f}(\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}) = 0 \quad (72)$$

for $1 \leq j \leq k_0 - k_{0f}$, $1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}$ and $1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}$.

Therefore, from (69), (71) and (72), we conclude that the restriction of $\mathbb{P}(E_h^{\nabla})$ to P_f is tangent to P_f .

Next, we will prove that (68) holds. Using (62), (63) and (72), we have that

$$(i(X_{\xi_j^{(0)}}^{\nabla})\Omega_{h_0})|_{P_f} = 0, \quad \text{for every } j, 1 \leq j \leq k_0 - k_{0f}. \quad (73)$$

Furthermore, since the matrix $(\{\bar{\xi}_i^{(0)}, \bar{\xi}_{i'}^{(0)}\}|_{P_f}^{\nabla})_{1 \leq i, i' \leq l_0}$ is regular, one can find local real functions $\{\bar{\lambda}^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq l_0}$ on $J^{1*}E$ such that the restriction to P_f of the vector field

$$X_{h_0}^0 = E_h^{\nabla} - \bar{\lambda}^i X_{\xi_i^{(0)}}^{\nabla}$$

is tangent to P_0 . Moreover, it follows that (see (62) and Theorem 13)

$$(i(X_{h_0}^0)\Omega_{h_0})|_{P_f} = (\bar{\lambda}^j E_h^{\nabla}(\bar{\xi}_j^{(0)})\eta^0)|_{P_f}.$$

But as $X_{h_0}^0|_{P_0}$ is tangent to P_0 , we have

$$0 = (\bar{\lambda}^j X_{h_0}^0(\bar{\xi}_j^{(0)}))|_{P_f} = (\bar{\lambda}^j E_h^{\nabla}(\bar{\xi}_j^{(0)}))|_{P_f} - (\bar{\lambda}^i \bar{\lambda}^j \{\bar{\xi}_j^{(0)}, \bar{\xi}_i^{(0)}\}^{\nabla})|_{P_f} = (\bar{\lambda}^j E_h^{\nabla}(\bar{\xi}_j^{(0)}))|_{P_f}.$$

Thus, we deduce that

$$(i(X_{h_0}^0)\Omega_{h_0})|_{P_f} = 0, \quad (i(X_{h_0}^0)\eta^0)|_{P_f} = 1. \quad (74)$$

This implies that

$$(i(X_{h_0}^f - X_{h_0}^0)\Omega_{h_0})|_{P_f} = 0, \quad (i(X_{h_0}^f - X_{h_0}^0)\eta^0)|_{P_f} = 0$$

and consequently (see (65) and Lemma 11)

$$X_{h_0}^f = (E_{h^\nabla} - \bar{\lambda}^i X_{\xi_i^{(0)}}^\nabla - \bar{\mu}^j X_{\xi_j^{(0)}}^\nabla - \bar{\kappa}^k X_{\xi_k^{(0)}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}, \quad (75)$$

where $\bar{\mu}^j$ and $\bar{\kappa}^k$ are local real functions on $J^{1*}E$.

Now, from (70), (75), and since $(X_{\xi_t^{(0)}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}$ and $(\mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}))|_{P_f} - X_{h_0}^f$ are tangent to P_f , we obtain that the restriction to P_f of the vector field

$$Z = (\bar{\lambda}^i - \lambda^i)X_{\xi_i^{(0)}}^\nabla + (\bar{\mu}^j - \mu^j)X_{\xi_j^{(0)}}^\nabla - \nu^r X_{\xi_r^{(f)}}^\nabla$$

is also tangent to P_f . Hence, it follows that $Z(x_f) \in D(x_f) \cap \#_{\bar{\lambda}^\nabla}(x_f)(D^0(x_f)) = \{0\}$, for all $x_f \in P_f$, and therefore

$$(\bar{\lambda}^i - \lambda^i)|_{P_f} = 0, \quad (\bar{\mu}^j - \mu^j)|_{P_f} = 0, \quad (\nu^r)|_{P_f} = 0,$$

for every i, j and r . This implies that (see (70))

$$(\mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}))|_{P_f} = (X_{h_0}^0 - \bar{\mu}^j X_{\xi_j^{(0)}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}. \quad (76)$$

Finally, using (73), (74) and (76), we conclude that

$$[i(\mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}))\Omega_{h_0}]|_{P_f} = 0, \quad [i(\mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}))\eta^0]|_{P_f} = 1.$$

■

Remark 14 If $TP_f \cap \#_{\bar{\lambda}^\nabla}((TP_f)^0) = \{0\}$ and $j_f : P_f \rightarrow J^{1*}E$ is the canonical inclusion, then the couple $(j_f^*(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla), j_f^*(\tilde{\eta}))$ defines a cosymplectic structure on P_f (see Remark 12), and $(\mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}))|_{P_f}$ is just the evolution vector field of $(h_0^\nabla)|_{P_f}$ with respect to the structure $(j_f^*(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla), j_f^*(\tilde{\eta}))$.

Remark 15 Let $\mathcal{Y}'_E$ be the vector field on E associated with another connection ∇' on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, and $h_0^{\nabla'} : P_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the corresponding Hamiltonian function. Using Remark 9, we deduce that

$$h^{\nabla'} = h^\nabla - i\widetilde{V}$$

is an extension to $J^{1*}E$ of the Hamiltonian function $h_0^{\nabla'}$, where $i\widetilde{V} : J^{1*}E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the real function on $J^{1*}E$ induced by the π -vertical vector field $V = \mathcal{Y}'_E - \mathcal{Y}_E$. Thus, from Theorem 12 and Proposition 10 (see Appendix B), we obtain that the evolution vector fields E_{h^∇} and $E_{h^{\nabla'}}$ of h^∇ and $h^{\nabla'}$ with respect to the cosymplectic structures $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ and $(\tilde{\omega}^{\nabla'}, \tilde{\eta})$ coincide. As a consequence, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}) = \mathbb{P}(E_{h^{\nabla'}}).$$

6.3 Dirac brackets and evolution of an observable

Splitting $T_U J^{1*}E = D \oplus \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}(D^0)$ allows us to introduce a *Dirac bracket* $\{ , \}_D^\nabla$, which can be defined as follows (see Appendix B). If F and G are C^∞ -differentiable real functions on U , then

$$\{F, G\}_D^\nabla = \tilde{\omega}^\nabla(\mathbb{P}(X_F^\nabla), \mathbb{P}(X_G^\nabla)),$$

where $\mathbb{P} : T_U J^{1*}E \rightarrow D$ is the projector considered in Section 6.2.

A direct computation, using (67), proves that

$$\{F, G\}_D^\nabla = \{F, G\}^\nabla + \bar{C}^{\alpha\beta} \{F, \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta\}^\nabla \{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha, G\}^\nabla. \quad (77)$$

Moreover, we have

Theorem 15 (i) *The Dirac bracket $\{ , \}_D^\nabla$ is a Poisson bracket and the Hamiltonian vector field of a C^∞ -differentiable real function F on U (with respect to $\{ , \}_D^\nabla$) is $\mathbb{P}(X_F^\nabla)$.*

(ii) *If g is an observable (that is, g is a C^∞ -differentiable real function on P_f), its evolution is given by the formula*

$$\dot{g} = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}(G) + (\{G, h^\nabla\}_D^\nabla)|_{P_f},$$

where $h^\nabla : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $G : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are arbitrary extensions to U of the Hamiltonian function $h_0^\nabla : P_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and of $g : P_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, respectively.

(iii) *If F is a C^∞ -differentiable real function on U such that $X_F^\nabla(x) \in \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}(D^0)(x)$, for every $x \in U$, then F is a Casimir function for the Dirac bracket, i.e.,*

$$\{F, G\}_D^\nabla = 0, \quad \text{for every } G \in C^\infty(U).$$

(iv) *If F is a C^∞ -differentiable real function on U such that the restriction to P_f of X_F^∇ is tangent to P_f , then $(\{F, G\}_D^\nabla)|_{P_f} = (\{F, G\}^\nabla)|_{P_f}$, for every $G \in C^\infty(U)$.*

(Proof) (i) Using Proposition 11 (see Appendix B), and the fact that D is a completely integrable distribution, we deduce that $\{ , \}_D^\nabla$ is a Poisson bracket. Furthermore, from (67) and (77), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_F^\nabla)(G) = \{G, F\}_D^\nabla, \quad \text{for } F, G \in C^\infty(U).$$

(ii) If $E_{h^\nabla}^\nabla = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla + X_{h^\nabla}^\nabla$ is the evolution vector field of h^∇ with respect to the cosymplectic structure $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$, then from Theorem 14 it follows that

$$\dot{g} = \mathbb{P}(E_{h^\nabla}^\nabla)|_{P_f}(g).$$

Thus, using the first part of this Theorem, we have that

$$\dot{g} = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}(G) + \mathbb{P}(X_{h^\nabla}^\nabla)|_{P_f}(G) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}(G) + (\{G, h^\nabla\}_D^\nabla)|_{P_f}.$$

(iii) If $F \in C^\infty(U)$ and $X_F^\nabla(x) \in \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}(D^0)(x)$, for every $x \in U$, then it is clear that $\mathbb{P}(X_F^\nabla) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\{F, G\}_D^\nabla = -\{G, F\}_D^\nabla = -\mathbb{P}(X_F^\nabla)(G) = 0, \quad \text{for every } G \in C^\infty(U).$$

(iv) The condition $(X_F^\nabla)|_{P_f} \in \mathfrak{X}(P_f)$ implies that $(\mathbb{P}(X_F^\nabla))|_{P_f} = (X_F^\nabla)|_{P_f}$, and consequently

$$(\{F, G\}_D^\nabla)|_{P_f} = -(X_F^\nabla)|_{P_f}(G) = (\{F, G\}^\nabla)|_{P_f}.$$

■

From Theorem 15, we deduce that

$$\{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha, F\}_D^\nabla = 0,$$

for every α and $F \in C^\infty(U)$. In other words, the second class constraints $\{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha\}$ are Casimir functions for the Dirac bracket $\{, \}_D^\nabla$. Using Theorem 15, we also obtain that

$$(\{\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}, F\}_D^\nabla)|_{P_f} = (\{\hat{\xi}_t^{(0)}, F\}^\nabla)|_{P_f}, \quad \{\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}, F\}_D^\nabla|_{P_f} = \{\tilde{\xi}_u^{(f)}, F\}^\nabla|_{P_f},$$

for every t and u , $1 \leq t \leq k_{0f}$ and $1 \leq u \leq k_f - k_{0f}$.

Remark 16 If $\mathbb{T}P_f \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}(\mathbb{T}(P_f)^0) = \{0\}$ and $j_f : P_f \rightarrow J^{1*}E$ is the canonical inclusion, we can consider the cosymplectic structure $(j_f^*(\tilde{\omega})^\nabla, j_f^*(\tilde{\eta}))$ on P_f whose Reeb vector field is $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)|_{P_f}$ (see Remark 12). Furthermore, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\tilde{U})$ and $G \in C^\infty(U)$,

$$(i(\mathbb{P}(X_G^\nabla))\tilde{\omega}^\nabla)(\mathbb{P}(X)) = (dG - \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla(G)\tilde{\eta})(\mathbb{P}(X)) - \tilde{\omega}^\nabla(\mathbb{Q}(X_G^\nabla), \mathbb{P}(X)).$$

Thus, from (67), we have that

$$(i(\mathbb{P}(X_G^\nabla))\tilde{\omega}^\nabla)(\mathbb{P}(X)) = dG(\mathbb{P}(X)) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla)(G)\tilde{\eta}(\mathbb{P}(X))$$

and, since $\mathbb{P}(X_G^\nabla)|_{P_f}$ is tangent to P_f , it follows that $\mathbb{P}(X_G^\nabla)|_{P_f}$ is the Hamiltonian vector field of $g = G|_{P_f}$ with respect to the cosymplectic structure $(j_f^*(\tilde{\omega})^\nabla, j_f^*(\tilde{\eta}))$. Therefore, if on P_f (resp. $J^{1*}E$) we consider the Poisson structure induced by the cosymplectic structure $(j_f^*(\tilde{\omega})^\nabla, j_f^*(\tilde{\eta}))$ (resp. by the Dirac bracket $\{, \}_D^\nabla$) then the canonical inclusion j_f is a Poisson morphism.

Remark 17 If ∇' is another connection on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, then we can obtain the same splitting of $\mathbb{T}_U(J^{1*}E)$ and the same projectors $\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{T}_U J^{1*}E \rightarrow D$ and $\mathbb{Q} : \mathbb{T}_U J^{1*}E \rightarrow \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{\nabla'}}(D^0) = \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}(D^0)$. As a consequence, using (77) and Theorem 12, we conclude that the Dirac brackets coincide, i.e.,

$$\{, \}_D^\nabla = \{, \}_D^{\nabla'}.$$

7 Examples

In this Section, we illustrate some aspects of the theory with two examples. In the first, we treat the particular case where the base manifold B is $\mathbb{R}$ and the submersion π is a trivial fibration of E on $\mathbb{R}$ and, as a consequence, we recover some results obtained in [10, 31]. In the second example, we consider the special case of time-dependent Lagrangians which are affine on the velocities.

7.1 Example 1

Suppose that $B = \mathbb{R}$ and that $\pi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a trivial fibration; that is, Q is a differentiable manifold of dimension n , $E = \mathbb{R} \times Q$ and $\pi : E = \mathbb{R} \times Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the canonical projection over the first factor. Then, the evolution phase space J^1E of the system can be identified with the product manifold $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}Q$ in such a way that the fibration $\pi^1 : J^1E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the map $\bar{\tau}_Q = Id \times \tau_Q : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$, where $\tau_Q : \mathbb{T}Q \rightarrow Q$ is the canonical projection (see [42]).

Now, let t be the usual coordinate on $\mathbb{R}$ and ϖ the volume form given by $\varpi = dt$. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a Lagrangian density on $J^1E \cong \mathbb{R} \times TQ$, we have that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}\eta$, with $\eta = (\bar{\pi}^1)^*(dt)$ and $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the Lagrangian function.

The Lagrangian function and the *Liouville vector field* C of TQ allow us to introduce the *Lagrangian energy* $E_{\mathcal{L}} : \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the real function on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ defined by

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} = C(\mathcal{L}) - \mathcal{L}.$$

If (t, q^ν, v^ν) are fibered coordinates on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$, we have that

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} = v^\nu \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^\nu} - \mathcal{L}.$$

Furthermore, the vector field $\mathcal{Y}_E = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ (resp. $\mathcal{Y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$) on $\mathbb{R} \times Q$ (resp. $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$) induces a distinguished connection ∇ (resp. $\bar{\nabla}$) on the fibration $\pi : \mathbb{R} \times Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\bar{\pi}_Q : \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.) Thus, if M_i is the i th-Lagrangian dynamical constraint submanifold, one can give several descriptions of M_i as the zero set of the i th-generation dynamical Lagrangian constraints $\{\zeta^{(i)}\}$ (see Theorem 4). In particular, using Theorem 4, we deduce that

$$\zeta^{(i)} = i(\mathcal{Z}^{(i)})(\eta - \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}), \quad \text{for } \mathcal{Z}^{(i)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(M_i),$$

where $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the 1-form on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ given by $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = i(\frac{\partial}{\partial t})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, and $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the Poincare-Cartan 2-form. This description of the constraints $\zeta^{(i)}$ was obtained in [10]. On its turn, the description of the i th-generation of SODE Lagrangian constraints is given in Theorem 10.

Next, we will assume that the Lagrangian system $(J^1E, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is almost regular.

Note that in the particular case where the fibration π is trivial, the restricted momentum dual bundle associated with π can be identified with the product manifold $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$. In addition, the map

$$\begin{aligned} J^1E \times \mathbb{R} &\cong (\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q) \times \mathbb{R} &\longrightarrow & T^*E = T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \\ ((\lambda, \alpha), \mu) &&\longrightarrow & \alpha + \mu dt(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

is a diffeomorphism. Moreover, in [10] it was proved that the Lagrangian energy $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ is $\mathcal{FL}_0$ -projectable onto a real function $\tilde{h}_0^\nabla : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Using this function, a diffeomorphism $\tilde{h}_0 : \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \subseteq T^*E \cong (\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q) \times \mathbb{R}$ can be defined as follows

$$\tilde{h}_0(\tilde{x}) = (\tilde{x}, -\tilde{h}_0^\nabla(\tilde{x})), \quad \text{for every } \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{P}.$$

A direct computation shows that $\tilde{h}_0 = h_0 = \mu_0^{-1}$, where $\mu_0 : \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is the restriction to $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ of the canonical projection $\mu : T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ (see Section 4.1). Therefore, the Hamilton-Cartan forms Θ_{h_0} and Ω_{h_0} are given by $\Theta_{h_0} = (\tilde{j}_0 \circ \tilde{h}_0)^*\Theta$ and $\Omega_{h_0} = (\tilde{j}_0 \circ \tilde{h}_0)^*\Omega$, Θ and Ω being the Liouville 1-form and the Liouville 2-form, respectively, of $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$.

Now, if $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$ is a vector field on $\mathcal{P}$ which is τ_0^1 -projectable onto the vector field $\mathcal{Y}_E = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$ induces a connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ in the fibration $\tilde{\tau}_0^1 : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Using this connection, one can give several descriptions of the i th-Hamiltonian dynamical constraint submanifold P_i as the zero set of the i th-generation dynamical Hamiltonian constraints $\{\xi^{(i)}\}$ (see Theorem 7). In particular, from Theorem 7, it follows that

$$\xi^{(i)} = i(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(i)})(\eta^0 - \gamma_{h_0}), \quad \text{for } \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(i)} \in \mathfrak{X}^\perp(P_i),$$

where $\eta^0 = (\tilde{\tau}_0^1)^*dt$ and γ_{h_0} is the 1-form on $\mathcal{P}$ given by $\gamma_{h_0} = i(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}})\Omega_{h_0}$. This description of the constraints $\xi^{(i)}$ was obtained in [10].

Moreover, it is clear that $\tilde{h}_0^\nabla$ is just the Hamiltonian function h_0^∇ on $\mathcal{P}$ associated with the Lagrangian system, the connection ∇ on $\pi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the 1-form $\varpi = dt$. In addition, if $h^\nabla : \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an extension to $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ of the Hamiltonian function h_0^∇ , then we deduce that $\tilde{\Theta}^\nabla$ and $\tilde{\omega}^\nabla$ are the Liouville 1-form and the Liouville 2-form of T^*Q , respectively, that $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\nabla = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, and that

$$\Theta_{h^\nabla} = \tilde{\Theta}^\nabla + h^\nabla dt, \quad \Omega_{h^\nabla} = \tilde{\omega}^\nabla + dh^\nabla \wedge dt.$$

As a consequence, the bracket $\{ , \}^\nabla$ on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ is the usual Poisson bracket on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ (see Section 6.1).

Finally, suppose that $\{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha\}$ is a maximal set of local independent second class constraints for the final Hamiltonian dynamical constraint submanifold P_f , and denote by $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta}$ the real function defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta} = \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha}{\partial t} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta}{\partial t} = \{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha, \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta\}^\nabla + \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha}{\partial t} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta}{\partial t}, \quad \text{for every } \alpha \text{ and } \beta.$$

Then, since the matrix $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha\beta})$ is regular, we deduce that the matrix $(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta})$ also is regular. In fact, if $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta})$ is the inverse matrix of $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha\beta})$ and

$$\mathcal{C}^{\alpha\beta} = \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta} + \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\gamma} \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta\nu} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}{\partial t} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\nu}{\partial t}$$

then $(\mathcal{C}^{\alpha\beta})$ is the inverse matrix of $(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta})$ (note that the skew-symmetric character of the matrix $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha\beta})$ implies that $\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma'\nu'} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_{\gamma'}}{\partial t} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_{\nu'}}{\partial t} = 0$). Thus, if $\{ , \}_D^\nabla$ is the corresponding Dirac bracket on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$, using (77), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \{F, G\}_D^\nabla &= \{F, G\}^\nabla - \mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta} \{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta, G\}^\nabla \{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha, F\}^\nabla \\ &\quad - \mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{C}_{\alpha'\beta'} \{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_\beta, G\}^\nabla \{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{\beta'}, F\}^\nabla \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha}{\partial t} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{X}}_{\alpha'}}{\partial t}, \end{aligned}$$

for $F, G \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$. This expression for the Dirac bracket $\{ , \}_D^\nabla$ was obtained in [31].

7.2 Example 2

Let γ be a 1-form on the configuration space E and $\mathcal{L} : J^1 E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Lagrangian function defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(j_t^1 \phi) = \hat{\gamma}(j_t^1 \phi) = \gamma(\dot{\phi}(t)), \quad \text{for } j_t^1 \phi \in J^1 E.$$

If we take fibered coordinates (t, q^i, v_i) on $J^1 E$ such that $\gamma = \gamma_i(t, q) dq^i + \gamma_0(t, q) dt$ then

$$\hat{\gamma}(t, q^i, v^i) = \gamma_i(t, q) v^i + \gamma_0(t, q).$$

Thus $\mathcal{L} = \hat{\gamma}$ is an *affine Lagrangian on the velocities*.

A direct computation shows that $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = (\pi^1)^* \gamma$ and hence $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = (\pi^1)^*(-d\gamma)$. We also obtain that $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}} = \gamma \circ \pi^1$. Therefore, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is an embedded submanifold of T^*E which is diffeomorphic to E . The mapping $\tilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0 : J^1 E \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \gamma(E)$ may be viewed as the composition

$$J^1 E \xrightarrow{\pi^1} E \xrightarrow{\gamma} \gamma(E) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}.$$

Since $\gamma : E \rightarrow \gamma(E)$ is a diffeomorphism and π^1 is a surjective submersion with connected fibers, we deduce that $\tilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0 : J^1 E \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is also a surjective submersion with connected fibers. Moreover,

it is easy to prove that $\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0(x)) = \mathcal{FL}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}_0(x)) = (\pi^1)^{-1}(\pi^1(x))$, for every $x \in J^1E$. As a consequence, the Lagrangian is almost-regular. Note that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \tilde{\mathcal{P}} & \xrightarrow{\mu_0} & \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{FL}_0(J^1E) \\
 & \nearrow \gamma & \uparrow \widetilde{\mathcal{FL}}_0 & \nearrow \mathcal{FL}_0 & \\
 E & & & & \\
 & \nwarrow \pi^1 & J^1E & &
 \end{array}$$

is commutative, that the mappings $\gamma : E \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mu_0 : \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ are diffeomorphisms and that $(\mu_0 \circ \gamma)^*(\Omega_{h_0}) = -d\gamma$, and $(\mu_0 \circ \gamma)^*(\eta^0) = \pi^*(\varpi)$. Thus, the submanifold $\mathcal{P}$ can be identified with E and, with this identification, the mapping $\mathcal{FL}_0 : J^1E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is the submersion $\pi^1 : J^1E \rightarrow E$ and the 2-form Ω_{h_0} (resp. the 1-form η^0) on $\mathcal{P}$ is the 2-form $-d\gamma$ (resp. the 1-form $\pi^*(dt)$). Taking these identifications into account, the constrained Hamilton equations on E are

$$i(Y)(d\gamma) = 0, \quad i(Y)(\pi^*(dt)) = 1. \quad (78)$$

Next, we will assume that the couple $(d\gamma, \pi^*(dt))$ is a cosymplectic structure on E with Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_\gamma$. Then, a direct computation shows that the matrix $(\gamma_{ij} = \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial q^j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is regular and that

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ij} \left(\frac{\partial \gamma_0}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial t} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j}, \quad (79)$$

where $(\gamma^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is the inverse matrix of $(\gamma_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$.

Furthermore, it is clear that the final constraint submanifold for the Hamiltonian problem is $P_0 = \mathcal{P}$ and that there exists a unique solution Y_{h_0} of the constrained Hamiltonian equations (78); namely, the Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_\gamma$.

Moreover, if $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a vector field on J^1E which projects via $\mathcal{FL}_0$ onto $\mathcal{R}_\gamma = Y_{h_0}$, then $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution of the dynamical Lagrangian equations on J^1E . In addition, the corresponding submanifold S of J^1E (see Section 4.5) is $\mathcal{R}_\gamma(E)$ and the unique vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}^S \equiv \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ on S satisfying

$$i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}|_S = 0, \quad i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\eta|_S = 1, \quad \mathcal{J}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})|_S = 0$$

is $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = (\mathcal{R}_\gamma)^c|_S$, where $(\mathcal{R}_\gamma)^c$ denotes the complete lift of $\mathcal{R}_\gamma$ to TE (see [32]). From (79) and the results of Section 4.5, we deduce that S can be locally described as follows

$$S = \{(t, q^j, v^j) \in J^1E \mid v^j = \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ij} \left(\frac{\partial \gamma_0}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial t} \right), \forall j\}.$$

Another way of finding Euler-Lagrange vector fields is by applying the procedure described in Section 5. As there is solution of the dynamical Lagrangian equations (1) everywhere in J^1E , we look for the submanifold of J^1E where solutions satisfying the SODE condition exist. The corresponding compatibility conditions (1st-generation SODE Lagrangian constraints) are given by Prop. 6. In this case, these constraints are

$$\phi^{(1)j} := v^j - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ij} \left(\frac{\partial \gamma_0}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial t} \right)$$

Hence $S_1 = S$. The corresponding Euler-Lagrange vector fields are

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}|_{S_1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ij} \left(\frac{\partial \gamma_0}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial t} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} + F^j \frac{\partial}{\partial v^j}.$$

The tangency conditions $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(\phi^{(1)j})|_{S_1} = 0$ determine all the coefficients F^j , then we obtain the unique solution $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}|_{S_1} = (\mathcal{R}_{\gamma})^c|_{S_1}$. Thus, $S_F = S_1 = S$ (see the comments made in Section 5.4).

Now, let ∇ be a connection on $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, and $\mathcal{Y}_E$ be the associated vector field on E such that $\pi^*(\varpi)(\mathcal{Y}_E) = 1$.

Using (51) and (52), we obtain that

$$h_0^\nabla = -\gamma(\mathcal{Y}_E),$$

$h_0^\nabla : P_0 \cong E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being the Hamiltonian function.

Moreover, a set of local independent constraint functions defining $P_0 = \mathcal{P}$ as a submanifold of $J^{1*}E$ is given by

$$\xi_i^{(0)} = p_i - \gamma_i(t, q), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (80)$$

From (64) and (80) it follows that

$$\{\xi_i^{(0)}, \xi_j^{(0)}\}^\nabla|_{P_0(\cong E)} = \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial q^j} = \gamma_{ij} \quad (81)$$

and, hence we conclude that the matrix $(\{\xi_i^{(0)}, \xi_j^{(0)}\}^\nabla|_{P_0})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is regular. Thus, all the constraints $\{\xi_i^{(0)}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ are second class and $\text{TP}_0 \cap \#_{\tilde{\Lambda}^\nabla}((\text{TP}_0)^0) = \{0\}$. Furthermore, with the identification $P_0 = \mathcal{P} \cong E$, the cosymplectic structure on E induced by the couple $(\tilde{\omega}^\nabla, \tilde{\eta})$ (see Remark 12) is

$$(-d\gamma + d(\gamma(\mathcal{Y}_E)) \wedge \pi^*(dt), \pi^*(dt)).$$

Finally, if $\{, \}^\nabla_D$ is the Dirac bracket on $J^{1*}E$, then using (64), (77) and (81), we deduce that

$$\{F, G\}^\nabla_D = \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial G}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial G}{\partial q^i} \right) - \gamma^{ij} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial q^i} + \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial q^k} \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_k} \right) \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial q^j} + \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial q^l} \frac{\partial G}{\partial p_l} \right)$$

for $F, G \in C^\infty(J^{1*}E)$.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the financial support of the CICYT PB98-0821, PB97-1257, PB98-0920, BFM2000-0808 and PGC2000-2191-E. We wish to thank Mr. Jeff Palmer for his assistance in preparing the English version of the manuscript.

Appendices

A Precosymplectic vector spaces

Let V be a real vector space of finite dimension, and suppose that ω is a 2-form on V and $\eta \in V^*$. We can consider the linear map $b_{(\eta, \omega)} : V \rightarrow V^*$ given by

$$b_{(\eta, \omega)}(v) = i(v)\omega + (i(v)\eta)\eta, \quad \text{for every } v \in V.$$

If S is a subspace of V , we will denote by S^0 the annihilator of S ; that is,

$$S^0 = \{\alpha \in V^* / i(u)\alpha = 0, \quad \forall u \in S\},$$

and, in the same way, for a subspace W of V^* ,

$$W^0 = \{u \in V / i(u)\alpha = 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in W\}.$$

Then, if K is a subspace of V we define the *orthogonal subspace* of K with respect to η and ω as

$$K^\perp = (\flat_{(\eta, \omega)}(K))^0 = \{v \in V / (i(v)\omega - (i(v)\eta)\eta)|_K = 0\}. \quad (82)$$

A *precosymplectic structure* on a real vector space on V is a triad $(\eta, \omega, \mathcal{R})$, where $\eta \in V^*$, ω is a 2-form on V , $\mathcal{R} \in V$ and

$$i(\mathcal{R})\omega = 0, \quad i(\mathcal{R})\eta = 1.$$

Note that, in this case, the rank of $\flat_{(\eta, \omega)}$ is odd. Moreover, we have

Lemma 12 *Let $(\eta, \omega, \mathcal{R})$ be a precosymplectic structure on a real vector space. Then:*

- (i) $V^\perp = \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$.
- (ii) If K is a subspace of V , then $\dim K^\perp = \dim V - \dim K + \dim(V^\perp \cap K)$.
- (iii) If K and K' are subspaces of V , $K' \subseteq K$ then $K^\perp \subseteq (K')^\perp$.

(Proof) (i) It is clear that $\ker \omega \cap \ker \eta \subseteq V^\perp$. Conversely, if $v \in V^\perp$ then

$$0 = (i(v)\omega - (i(v)\eta)\eta)(\mathcal{R}) = -i(v)\eta,$$

which implies that $i(v)\omega = 0$, that is, $v \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$.

(ii) Consider the linear map

$$\flat_{(\eta, \omega)|K} : K \rightarrow V^*, \quad u \in K \rightarrow \flat_{(\eta, \omega)}(u) = i(u)\omega + (i(u)\eta)\eta \in V^*.$$

A direct computation shows that $\ker(\flat_{(\eta, \omega)|K}) = V^\perp \cap K$. Moreover, we have

$$\flat_{(\eta, \omega)|K}(K) = \flat_{(\eta, \omega)}(K) = ((\flat_{(\eta, \omega)}(K))^0)^0 = (K^\perp)^0.$$

Therefore,

$$\dim K - \dim(V^\perp \cap K) = \dim V - \dim K^\perp.$$

(iii) It follows from (82). ■

Now, let Ω a 2-form on a real vector space V of finite dimension and $\eta \in V^*$. If $\mathcal{R}$ is a vector of V such that $\eta(\mathcal{R}) = 1$, we can consider the 2-form $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}$ defined by

$$\omega_{\mathcal{R}} = \Omega - \eta \wedge \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \quad (83)$$

where $\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \in V^*$ is given by

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} = i(\mathcal{R})(\Omega). \quad (84)$$

It is clear that the triad $(\eta, \omega_{\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{R})$ is a precosymplectic structure on V .

If K is a subspace of V , we will denote by $K_{(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}, \eta)}^\perp$ the orthogonal subspace of K with respect to $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}$ and η .

Lemma 13 *Suppose that $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}'$ are vectors of V such that $\eta(\mathcal{R}) = \eta(\mathcal{R}') = 1$. Then:*

$$(i) \quad V_{(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}, \eta)}^{\perp} = V_{(\omega_{\mathcal{R}'}, \eta)}^{\perp}.$$

(ii) *If K is a subspace of V , we have*

$$\dim K_{(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}, \eta)}^{\perp} = \dim K_{(\omega_{\mathcal{R}'}, \eta)}^{\perp}.$$

(Proof) (i) We must prove that $\ker \omega_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \ker \eta = \ker \omega_{\mathcal{R}'} \cap \ker \eta$ (see the first part of Lemma 12).

From (83) and (84), we deduce that

$$\omega_{\mathcal{R}'} = \omega_{\mathcal{R}} + \eta \wedge (\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} - \gamma_{\mathcal{R}'}).$$

Thus, if $v \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \ker \eta$ then $i(v)\omega_{\mathcal{R}'} = -i(v)(\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} - \gamma_{\mathcal{R}'})\eta$. In particular,

$$0 = i(\mathcal{R}')i(v)\omega_{\mathcal{R}'} = -i(v)(\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} - \gamma_{\mathcal{R}'})$$

which implies that $i(v)\omega_{\mathcal{R}'} = 0$.

This shows that $\ker \omega_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \ker \eta \subseteq \ker \omega_{\mathcal{R}'} \cap \ker \eta$. The converse is proved in a similar way.

(ii) It follows from (i) and the second part of Lemma 12. ■

Next, we will exhibit the definition and some properties of cosymplectic structures on a real vector space (for more information, see [2, 4, 31]).

Let V be a real vector space of dimension $2n + 1$.

A *cosymplectic structure* on V is a couple (η, ω) , where $\eta \in V^*$, ω is a 2-form on V and the linear map $\flat_{(\eta, \omega)} : V \rightarrow V^*$ is a linear isomorphism or, equivalently, $\eta \wedge \omega^n = \eta \wedge \omega \wedge \dots \wedge \omega \neq 0$. If (V, η, ω) is a cosymplectic vector space then $\mathcal{R} = \flat_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}(\eta)$ is called the *Reeb vector* of V . $\mathcal{R}$ is the unique vector of V which satisfies the conditions

$$i(\mathcal{R})\eta = 1, \quad i(\mathcal{R})\omega = 0.$$

In particular the triad $(\eta, \omega, \mathcal{R})$ is a precosymplectic structure on V . Furthermore, using Lemma 12, it follows that

Lemma 14 [31] *Let (η, ω) be a cosymplectic structure on a real vector space V . Then:*

1. $V^{\perp} = \{0\}$.
2. *If K is a subspace of V , we have that $\dim K^{\perp} = \dim V - \dim K$.*
3. *If K is a subspace of V and $K \cap K^{\perp} = \{0\}$ then $V = K \oplus K^{\perp}$.*

We also get

Lemma 15 *Let (η, ω) be a cosymplectic structure on a real vector space V . Suppose that K is a subspace of V such that $K \cap K^{\perp} = \{0\}$ and that there exists $\mathcal{R}_K \in K$ satisfying*

$$i(\mathcal{R}_K)\omega_K = 0, \quad i(\mathcal{R}_K)\eta_K = 1, \tag{85}$$

where $\omega_K = \omega|_{K \times K}$ and $\eta_K = \eta|_K$. Then the couple (η_K, ω_K) is a cosymplectic structure on K and $\mathcal{R}_K$ is the Reeb vector of K .

(*Proof*) Let $\flat_{(\eta_K, \omega_K)} : K \rightarrow K^*$ be the linear map induced by the 2-form ω_K and the 1-form η_K . If $X \in \ker \flat_{(\eta_K, \omega_K)}$ then we deduce that $i(X)\omega_K = 0$, $i(X)\eta_K = 0$. Now, since $K \cap K^\perp = \{0\}$, it is easy to prove that

$$\ker \omega_K \cap \ker \eta_K = \{0\} \quad (86)$$

and thus $X = 0$. Therefore, the map $\flat_{(\eta_K, \omega_K)}$ is a linear isomorphism.

Furthermore, if $X \in \ker \omega_K$ then, from (85), it follows $X - \eta_K(X)\mathcal{R}_K \in \ker \omega_K \cap \ker \eta_K$ and consequently, from (86), we obtain that $X = \eta_K(X)\mathcal{R}_K$. Thus, $\ker \omega_K = \langle \mathcal{R}_K \rangle$, which implies that the dimension of K is odd. ■

B Poisson and cosymplectic structures and Dirac brackets

A *Poisson structure* on a differentiable manifold M is a bracket of functions $\{ , \} : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ which satisfies the following properties:

- *Skew-symmetry*: $\{F, G\} = -\{G, F\}$.
- *Leibniz rule*: $\{FF', G\} = F\{F', G\} + F'\{F, G\}$.
- *Jacobi identity*: $\{F, \{G, H\}\} + \{G, \{H, F\}\} + \{H, \{F, G\}\} = 0$.

If $\{ , \}$ is a Poisson bracket and $F \in C^\infty(M)$ one can define the *Hamiltonian vector field* X_F associated with F as follows

$$X_F(G) = \{G, F\}, \quad \text{for every } G \in C^\infty(M).$$

In addition, one also can define a 2-vector Λ characterized by the condition

$$\Lambda(dF, dG) = \{F, G\}, \quad \text{for } F, G \in C^\infty(M), \quad (87)$$

and it follows that $[\Lambda, \Lambda] = 0$, where $[,]$ is the *Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket*.

Conversely, if Λ is a 2-vector on M such that $[\Lambda, \Lambda] = 0$ and $\{ , \}$ is the bracket of functions given by (87), then $\{ , \}$ is a Poisson bracket (for more details, see [33, 45]).

Next, we show that a cosymplectic structure on manifold M induces a Poisson bracket on $C^\infty(M)$ (see [2, 4]). We need some results about cosymplectic vector spaces.

Let (V, η, ω) be a cosymplectic vector space with Reeb vector $\mathcal{R}$. If $\alpha \in V^*$, we can consider the vectors X_α and E_α defined by

$$X_\alpha = \flat_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha(\mathcal{R})\eta), \quad E_\alpha = \flat_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}(\alpha + (1 - \alpha(\mathcal{R}))\eta).$$

These vectors are characterized by the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_\alpha)\omega &= \alpha - \alpha(\mathcal{R})\eta, & i(X_\alpha)\eta &= 0, \\ i(E_\alpha)\omega &= \alpha - \alpha(\mathcal{R})\eta, & i(E_\alpha)\eta &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $E_\alpha = \mathcal{R} + X_\alpha$.

The cosymplectic structure (η, ω) also allows us to introduce a 2-vector $\Lambda : V^* \times V^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on V given by

$$\Lambda(\alpha, \beta) = \omega(X_\alpha, X_\beta) = \omega(E_\alpha, E_\beta), \quad \text{for } \alpha, \beta \in V^*.$$

The 2-vector Λ induces a linear map $\#_\Lambda : V^* \rightarrow V$ defined by $\beta(\#_\Lambda(\alpha)) = \Lambda(\alpha, \beta)$, for $\alpha, \beta \in V^*$. We have that

$$\flat_{(\eta, \omega)}(\#_\Lambda(\alpha)) = \alpha - \alpha(\mathcal{R})\eta.$$

In particular, $\#_\Lambda(V^*) = \ker \eta$, $\ker \#_\Lambda = \langle \eta \rangle$ and the map $\#_\Lambda : \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle^0 \rightarrow \ker \eta$ is a linear isomorphism.

If K is a subspace of V which satisfies certain conditions, then the map $\#_\Lambda$ can be used in order to obtain the orthogonal subspace of K with respect to (η, ω) .

Lemma 16 *If K is a subspace of V and there exists $\mathcal{R}_K \in K$ such that*

$$(i(\mathcal{R}_K)\omega)|_K = 0, \quad i(\mathcal{R}_K)\eta = 1 \quad (88)$$

then $K^\perp = \#_\Lambda(K^0)$.

(Proof) Suppose that $\alpha \in K^0$. Since $\eta(\#_\Lambda(\alpha)) = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (i(\#_\Lambda(\alpha))\omega - \eta(\#_\Lambda(\alpha))\eta)|_K &= (i(\#_\Lambda(\alpha))\omega)|_K = (\flat_{(\eta, \omega)}(\#_\Lambda(\alpha))|_K \\ &= (\alpha - \alpha(\mathcal{R})\eta)|_K = (-\alpha(\mathcal{R})\eta)|_K. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (88), we deduce that

$$0 = (-\alpha(\mathcal{R})\eta)(\mathcal{R}_K) = -\alpha(\mathcal{R})$$

and $(i(\#_\Lambda(\alpha))\omega - \eta(\#_\Lambda(\alpha))\eta)|_K = 0$, i.e., $\#_\Lambda(\alpha) \in K^\perp$. We have proved that $\#_\Lambda(K^0) \subseteq K^\perp$.

Now, using Lemma 14 and the fact that $K^0 \cap \langle \eta \rangle = \{0\}$, we obtain that

$$\dim \#_\Lambda(K^0) = \dim K^0 = \dim K^\perp.$$

■

Moreover, a direct computation shows the following.

Proposition 9 *Let (η, ω) be a cosymplectic structure on a real vector space V and $\mathcal{R}$ be the Reeb vector of V . Suppose that α is a 1-form on V and that $\tilde{\omega}$ is the 2-form on V defined by $\tilde{\omega} = \omega + \alpha \wedge \eta$. Then:*

1. *The couple $(\eta, \tilde{\omega})$ is a cosymplectic structure on V with the Reeb vector $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ given by $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = E_\alpha$, where $E_\alpha = \flat_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}(\alpha + (1 - \alpha(\mathcal{R}))\eta)$.*
2. *If β is a 1-form on V and X_β (resp. $\tilde{X}_\beta$) is the vector of V defined by $X_\beta = \flat_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}(\beta - \beta(\mathcal{R})\eta)$ (resp. $\tilde{X}_\beta = \flat_{(\eta, \tilde{\omega})}^{-1}(\beta - \beta(\mathcal{R})\eta)$) then $X_\beta = \tilde{X}_\beta$.*
3. *If Λ (resp. $\tilde{\Lambda}$) is the 2-vector on V induced by the structure (η, ω) (resp. $(\eta, \tilde{\omega})$) then $\Lambda = \tilde{\Lambda}$.*

Now, let M be an odd-dimensional differentiable manifold, and (η, ω) a cosymplectic structure on M ; that is, η is a closed 1-form, ω is a closed 2-form and the couple (η_x, ω_x) is a cosymplectic structure on the vector space $T_x M$, for every $x \in M$. Then there exists a unique vector field $\mathcal{R}$ on M , the *Reeb vector field*, satisfying the conditions $i(\mathcal{R})\omega = 0$ and $i(\mathcal{R})\eta = 1$. Moreover, using the above constructions on cosymplectic vector spaces, one can take the 2-vector Λ on M induced by the couple (η, ω) , and it follows that Λ defines a Poisson structure on M (see [2, 4]). In

addition, if $F \in C^\infty(M)$ we also can consider the vector fields X_F and E_F on M characterized by the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_F)\omega &= dF - \mathcal{R}(F)\eta, & i(X_F)\eta &= 0, \\ i(E_F)\omega &= dF - \mathcal{R}(F)\eta, & i(E_F)\eta &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

X_F is just the Hamiltonian vector field of F with respect to the Poisson structure Λ . E_F is called the *evolution vector field* of F with respect to the cosymplectic structure (η, ω) . We have that $E_F = \mathcal{R} + X_F$.

Furthermore, from Proposition 9, we deduce the following result.

Proposition 10 [5] *Let (η, ω) be a cosymplectic structure on a differentiable manifold M and $\mathcal{R}$ be the Reeb vector field of M . Suppose that F is C^∞ -differentiable real function on M and that $\tilde{\omega}$ is the 2-form on M defined by $\tilde{\omega} = \omega + dF \wedge \eta$. Then:*

1. *The couple $(\eta, \tilde{\omega})$ is a cosymplectic structure on M with Reeb vector field $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ given by*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = E_F,$$

where E_F is the evolution vector field of F with respect to the cosymplectic structure (η, ω) .

2. *If G is a C^∞ -differentiable real function on M and X_G (resp. $\tilde{X}_G$) is the Hamiltonian vector field of G with respect to the structure (η, ω) (resp. $(\eta, \tilde{\omega})$) then $X_G = \tilde{X}_G$.*
3. *If Λ (resp. $\tilde{\Lambda}$) is the Poisson 2-vector on M associated with the cosymplectic structure (η, ω) (resp. $(\eta, \tilde{\omega})$) then $\Lambda = \tilde{\Lambda}$.*

Next, assume that (η, ω) is a cosymplectic structure on a manifold M and that D is a distribution on M of dimension d satisfying

$$TM = D \oplus \#_\Lambda(D^0), \tag{89}$$

Λ being the Poisson 2-vector associated with the structure (η, ω) . The splitting (89) allows us to introduce two projectors

$$\mathbb{P} : TM \rightarrow D, \quad \mathbb{Q} : TM \rightarrow \#_\Lambda(D^0)$$

in such a way that $X = \mathbb{P}X + \mathbb{Q}X$, for every $X \in TM$.

Moreover, one can define a *Dirac bracket* of functions $\{ , \}_D$ as follows

$$\{F, G\}_D = \omega(\mathbb{P}(X_F), \mathbb{P}(X_G)),$$

for $F, G \in C^\infty(M)$, where X_F and X_G are the Hamiltonian vector fields of F and G with respect to the cosymplectic structure (η, ω) . It is clear that the bracket $\{ , \}_D$ is skew-symmetric and that it satisfies the Leibniz rule.

Moreover, since $(\eta(\#_\Lambda(\alpha)) = 0$ for every α , we deduce that $\eta(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R})) = 1$. Thus, it is easy to prove that $D(x) = \bar{D}(x) \oplus \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R})(x) \rangle$, for every $x \in M$, where $\bar{D}(x) = D(x) \cap \ker \eta_x$. Therefore, the assignment

$$x \in M \longrightarrow \bar{D}(x) \subseteq T_x M$$

defines a distribution $\bar{D}$ on M of dimension $d - 1$. In addition, we have

Proposition 11 [5] *The distribution $\bar{D}$ is completely integrable if and only if $\{ , \}_D$ is a Poisson bracket.*

Remark 18 If the distribution D is completely integrable then it is clear that the distribution $\bar{D}$ is also completely integrable.

C Auxiliary results

Taking into account the characterization of the submanifolds C_i given in Proposition 1, we can prove the following results (remember that $C_0 \equiv F$):

Lemma 17 *For every $x \in C_0$, $\ker \Omega_x \cap \ker \eta_x \subseteq \ker \omega_x \cap \ker \eta_x = T_x^\perp C_0$.*

(*Proof*) The last equality follows from Lemma 12.

For the first inclusion, if $X \in \ker \Omega_x \cap \ker \eta_x$ then

$$i(X)\omega_x = i(X)\Omega_x - i(X)(\eta_x \wedge \gamma_x) = i(X)\gamma_x \wedge \eta_x = i(X)i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega_x \wedge \eta_x = -i(\mathcal{Y})i(X)\Omega_x \wedge \eta_x = 0$$

and thus $X \in T_x^\perp C_0$. ■

Lemma 18 *For every $x \in C_1$, $\ker \Omega_x \cap \ker \eta_x = \ker \omega_x \cap \ker \eta_x = T_x^\perp C_0$.*

(*Proof*) If $X \in T_x^\perp C_0 = \ker \omega_x \cap \ker \eta_x$ then

$$i(X)\Omega_x = i(X)\omega_x + i(X)(\eta_x \wedge \gamma_x) = -[i(X)\gamma_x]\eta_x$$

but as $x \in C_1$, there exists $Y \in T_x C_0$ such that $i(Y)\Omega_x = 0$ and $i(Y)\eta_x = 1$; therefore the contraction of the above equality with this Y leads to $i(X)\gamma_x = 0$, and hence $i(X)\Omega_x = 0$. ■

Lemma 19 *For every $Z, Y \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, we get*

1. $i(Y)i(Z)d\gamma|_{C_1} = 0$.
2. $[Z, Y]|_{C_1} \in (\ker \omega \cap \ker \eta)|_{C_1}$.

(*Proof*)

1. As $Z, Y \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, we obtain that $i(Y)i(Z)\Omega = i(Y)i(Z)\omega + i(Y)i(Z)(\eta \wedge \gamma) = 0$.
Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} i(Y)i(Z)d\gamma &= i(Y)i(Z)d i(\mathcal{Y})\Omega = i(Y)i(Z)[L(\mathcal{Y})\Omega] \\ &= L(\mathcal{Y})i(Y)i(Z)\Omega - i(Y)i([\mathcal{Y}, Z])\Omega - i([\mathcal{Y}, Y])i(Z)\Omega \\ &= i([\mathcal{Y}, Z])i(Y)\Omega - i([\mathcal{Y}, Y])i(Z)\Omega \end{aligned}$$

However, as a consequence of the above Lemma, since $Z|_{C_1}, Y|_{C_1} \in (\ker \Omega \cap \ker \eta)|_{C_1}$, hence $i(Y)i(Z)d\gamma|_{C_1} = 0$.

2. Observe that as $Z, Y \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta$, and η is a closed form,

$$i([Z, Y])\eta = L(Z)i(Y)\eta - i(Y)L(Z)\eta = -i(Y)i(Z)d\eta - i(Y)d i(Z)\eta = 0,$$

then $[Z, Y] \in \ker \eta$. Moreover,

$$i([Z, Y])\omega = L(Z)i(Y)\omega - i(Y)L(Z)\omega = -i(Y)i(Z)d\omega - i(Y)d i(Z)\omega = -i(Y)i(Z)d\omega.$$

Now, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(C_0)$, as $d\omega = d\Omega - d(\eta \wedge \gamma) = \eta \wedge d\gamma$, we have

$$i(X) i(Y) i(Z) d\omega = i(X) i(Y) i(Z) (\eta \wedge d\gamma) = [i(X)\eta] i(Y) i(Z) d\gamma.$$

Therefore, for every $x \in C_1$, taking into account the first item we obtain

$$i(X_x) i(Y_x) i(Z_x) (d\gamma)_x = [i(X_x)\eta_x] i(Y_x) i(Z_x) (d\gamma)_x = 0$$

and the result follows. ■

References

- [1] R. ABRAHAM, J.E. MARSDEN, *Foundations of Mechanics*, 2^{ed}, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1978.
- [2] C. ALBERT, “Le théorème de réduction de Marsden-Weinstein en géométrie cosymplectique et de contact”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **6** (1989) 627-649.
- [3] C. BATLLE, J. GOMIS, J.M. PONS, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Equivalence between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism for constrained systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **27**(12) (1986) 2953-2962.
- [4] F. CANTRIJN, M. DE LEÓN, E.A. LACOMBA, “Gradient vector fields on cosymplectic manifolds”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** (1992) 175-188.
- [5] F. CANTRIJN, M. DE LEÓN, J.C. MARRERO, D. MARTÍN DE DIEGO, “On almost-Poisson structures in nonholonomic mechanics: II. The time-dependent framework”, *Nonlinearity* **13** (2000) 1379-1409.
- [6] J.F. CARIÑENA, M. CRAMPIN, L.A. IBORT, “On the multisymplectic formalism for first order field theories”, *Diff Geom. Appl.* **1** (1991) 345-374.
- [7] J.F. CARIÑENA, J. FERNÁNDEZ-NUÑEZ, “Geometric theory of time-dependent singular Lagrangians”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **41**(6) (1993) 517-552.
- [8] J.F. CARIÑENA, C. LÓPEZ, “The time evolution operator for singular Lagrangians”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **14** (1987) 203-210.
- [9] J.F. CARIÑENA, C. LÓPEZ, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Geometric study of the connection between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **4**(3) (1987) 315-334.
- [10] D. CHINEA, M. DE LEÓN, J.C. MARRERO, “The constraint algorithm for time-dependent Lagrangians”, *J. Math. Phys.* **7** (1994) 3410-3447.
- [11] P.A.M. DIRAC, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, (Belfer Graduate School of Science), New York, Yeshiva University, 1964.
- [12] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Geometrical setting of time-dependent regular systems. Alternative models”, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **3**(3) (1991) 301-330.
- [13] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Non-standard connections in classical mechanics”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **28**(12) (1995) 5553-5567.
- [14] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Geometry of Lagrangian First-order Classical Field Theories”, *Forts. Phys.* **44** (1996) 235-280.

- [15] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY “On the Multimomentum Bundles and the Legendre Maps in Field Theories”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **45**(1) (2000) 85-105.
- [16] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY “Geometry of multi-symplectic Hamiltonian first-order field theories”, *J. Math. Phys.* **41** (2000) 7402-7444.
- [17] G. GIACHETTA, L. MANGIAROTTI, G. SARDANASHVILY, “Differential Geometry of Time-Dependent Mechanics”, dg-ga/9702020.
- [18] G. GIACHETTA, L. MANGIAROTTI, G. SARDANASHVILY, *New Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Methods in Field Theory*, World Scientific Pub. Co., Singapore 1997.
- [19] M.J. GOTAY, J.M. NESTER, G. HINDS, “Presymplectic manifolds and the Dirac-Bergmann theory of constraints”, *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (1978) 2388-2399.
- [20] M.J. GOTAY, J.M. NESTER, “Presymplectic Lagrangian systems I: the constraint algorithm and the equivalence problem”, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **30** (1979) 129-142.
- [21] M.J. GOTAY, J.M. NESTER, “Presymplectic Lagrangian systems II: the second order equation problem”, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **32** (1980) 1-13.
- [22] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS, “On an evolution operator connecting Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **17** (1989) 175-180.
- [23] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS, “A generalized geometric framework for constrained systems”, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **2** (1992) 223-247.
- [24] L.A. IBORT, M. DE LEÓN, J.C. MARRERO, D. MARTÍN DE DIEGO, “Dirac brackets in constrained dynamics”, *Fortschritte für Physik* **47** 5 (1999), 459-492.
- [25] L.A. IBORT, J. MARÍN-SOLANO, “A geometric classification of Lagrangian functions and the reduction of evolution spaces”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** (1992) 3353-3367.
- [26] K. KAMIMURA, “Singular Lagrangians and constrained Hamiltonian systems, generalized canonical formalism”, *Nuovo Cim. B* **69** (1982) 33-54.
- [27] D. KRUPKA, O. STEPÁNKOVÁ, *On the Hamiltonian form in second order calculus of variations*, Geometry and Physics, Proc. Int. Meeting, Florence, Italy 1982, M. Modugno ed. , Pitagora Ed., Bologna (1983) 85-102.
- [28] O. KRUPKOVÁ, “Lepagean 2-forms in higher order Hamiltonian mechanics, I. Regularity”, *Arch. Math. (Brno)* **22** (1986) 97-120.
- [29] O. KRUPKOVÁ, “Lepagean 2-forms in higher order Hamiltonian mechanics, I. Inverse problem”, *Arch. Math. (Brno)* **23** (1987) 155-170.
- [30] O. KRUPKOVÁ, “A geometrical setting for higher-order Dirac-Bergmann theory of constraints”, *J. Math. Phys.* **35**(12) (1994) 6557-6576.
- [31] M. DE LEÓN, J.C. MARRERO, D. MARTÍN DE DIEGO, “Time-dependent constrained Hamiltonian systems and Dirac brackets”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **29** (1996) 6843-6859.
- [32] M. DE LEÓN, J. MARÍN-SOLANO, J.C. MARRERO, “The constraint algorithm in the jet formalism”, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **6** (1996) 275-300.
- [33] A. LICHNEROWICZ, “Les variétés de Poisson et leurs algèbres de Lie associées”, *J. Diff. Geom.* **12** (1977) 253-300.

- [34] L. MANGIAROTTI, G. SARDANASHVILY, “Gauge Mechanics”, *World Scientific*, Singapore, 1998.
- [35] G. MARMO, G. MENDELLA, W.M. TULCCZYJEW, “Constrained Hamiltonian systems as implicit differential equations”, *J. Phys. A* **30**(1) (1997) 277-293.
- [36] E. MASSA, S. VIGNOLO, “A new geometrical framework for time-dependent Hamiltonian Mechanics”, *Preprint, Univ. of Genoa* (2000).
- [37] M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, “Hamiltonian systems with constraints: a geometric approach”. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **28** (11) (1989) 1405-1417.
- [38] M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Lagrangian theory for presymplectic systems”, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **57**(1) (1992) 27-45.
- [39] M. F. RAÑADA, “Extended Legendre transformation approach to the time-dependent Hamiltonian formalism”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** (1992) 4025-4035.
- [40] G. SARDANASHVILY, *Generalized Hamiltonian Formalism for Field Theory. Constraint Systems*, World Scientific, Singapore 1995.
- [41] G. SARDANASHVILY, “Hamiltonian Time-dependent mechanics”, *J. Math. Phys.* **39**(5) (1998) 2714-2729.
- [42] D.J. SAUNDERS, *The Geometry of Jet Bundles*, London Math. Soc. Lect. Notes Ser. **142**, Cambridge, Univ. Press, 1989.
- [43] D. J. SAUNDERS, M. CRAMPIN, “On the Legendre map in higher-order field theories”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **23** (1990) 3169-3182.
- [44] R. SKINNER, R. RUSK, Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics I: Formulation on $T^*Q \otimes TQ$, *J. Math. Phys.* **24** (1983) 2589-2594.
- [45] I. VAISMAN, *Lectures on the geometry of Poisson manifolds*, Prog. Math. **118**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1994.
- [46] S. VIGNOLO, “A new presymplectic framework for time-dependent Lagrangian systems: the constraint algorithm and the second-order differential equation problem”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **33** (2000) 5117-5135.